


NACA TN 3459 3476



# NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

TECHNICAL NOTE 3459

SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES AND CHARTS FOR THE RAPID ESTIMATION  
OF BENDING FREQUENCIES OF ROTATING BEAMS

By Robert T. Yntema

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory  
Langley Field, Va.



Washington

June 1955

AFM 7C  
TECHNICAL NOTE 3459  
AFL 2811



## CONTENTS

SUMMARY . . . . .	1
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
SYMBOLS . . . . .	3
THE RAYLEIGH APPROACH APPLIED TO A ROTATING BEAM . . . . .	5
Description . . . . .	5
Evaluation of Rayleigh Approach . . . . .	8
Hinged beams without tip mass . . . . .	9
Cantilever beams without tip mass . . . . .	10
Cantilever beams with tip mass . . . . .	11
Hinged beams with tip mass . . . . .	12
Estimation of fundamental frequency of beam with tip mass . . . . .	13
CHARTS FOR BENDING-FREQUENCY DETERMINATION . . . . .	13
Rotating and Nonrotating Beams Without Tip Mass . . . . .	14
Application of charts to several actual helicopter blades . . . . .	16
Beams With a Mass at the Tip . . . . .	17
Uniform cantilever beam . . . . .	17
Uniform hinged beam . . . . .	18
Pendulum-mode results for hinged beams with linear mass distributions . . . . .	19
First bending mode frequency of nonuniform hinged beam . . . . .	19
Rotating Beams With Nonlinear Mass Distribution and Approximately Linear Stiffness Distribution . . . . .	19
Rotating Beams With Mass and Stiffness Distributions Not Representable by Foregoing Approximations . . . . .	20
Mode-Expansion Method . . . . .	21
Vibration in Planes Other Than Those Perpendicular to Plane of Rotation . . . . .	21
RESULTS FOR BENDING MODES . . . . .	22
Nonrotating Beams . . . . .	22
Rotating Beams . . . . .	23
Comparison of Rotating and Nonrotating Beams . . . . .	23
Hinged beams . . . . .	23
Cantilever beams . . . . .	24
Beams with a mass at tip . . . . .	24
CONCLUDING REMARKS . . . . .	24

APPENDIX A - SOLUTION OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION FOR	
ROTATING BEAM BY EXPANSION IN TERMS OF NORMAL	
MODES OF UNIFORM NONROTATING BEAM . . . . .	27
Solution by Galerkin Method . . . . .	27
Evaluation of the Integrals $I_{qp}$ , $M_{qp}$ , $R_{qp}$ , and $S_{qp}$ . . . . .	32
Numerical results for beams with linear mass and	
stiffness distributions with or without tip	
mass and offset . . . . .	32
Integrals for uniform beams with tip mass . . . . .	34
APPENDIX B - AN APPROXIMATE METHOD OF OBTAINING	
FIRST BENDING MODE OF HINGED BEAM WITH TIP MASS	
FROM FIRST BENDING MODE OF BEAM WITHOUT TIP MASS . . . . .	38
Beams With Linear Mass Distribution Plus Tip Mass . . . . .	41
Beams With Uniform Mass Distribution Plus Tip Mass . . . . .	42
Uniform Beam With Tip Mass . . . . .	42
REFERENCES . . . . .	44
TABLES . . . . .	46
FIGURES . . . . .	60

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

TECHNICAL NOTE 3459

SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES AND CHARTS FOR THE RAPID ESTIMATION  
OF BENDING FREQUENCIES OF ROTATING BEAMS<sup>1</sup>

By Robert T. Yntema

SUMMARY

A Rayleigh energy approach utilizing the bending mode of the nonrotating beam in the determination of the bending frequency of the rotating beam is evaluated and is found to give good practical results for helicopter blades.

Charts are presented for the rapid estimation of the first three bending frequencies for rotating and nonrotating cantilever and hinged beams with variable mass and stiffness distributions, as well as with root offsets from the axis of rotation. Some attention is also given to the case of rotating beams with a tip mass.

A more exact mode-expansion method used in evaluating the Rayleigh approach is also described. Numerous mode shapes and derivatives obtained in conjunction with the frequency calculations are presented in tabular form.

INTRODUCTION

Designers of helicopter rotor blades generally agree that accurate means are needed for estimating the natural bending frequencies of the rotating blades in order to obtain a blade design which is as free as possible from resonant or near-resonant excitation by the periodic loading on the rotor. Although numerous methods are available for determining the bending frequencies of rotating blades (see, for example, refs. 1 to 14), designers have expressed the need for a simplified, yet reasonably accurate, procedure for their determination, preferably in the form of a set of charts. With this need in mind, an investigation was undertaken which had a twofold purpose: (a) an evaluation to show whether a Rayleigh energy approach utilizing the mode shape of the nonrotating beam may be employed to obtain close approximations for the natural bending frequencies of the rotating beam and (b) a set of charts

---

<sup>1</sup>An amplified and extended version of NACA RM L54G02, 1954.

which would permit the rapid estimation of the first three bending frequencies of both nonrotating and rotating hinged and cantilever blades. The main purpose of this report is to present this evaluation and the frequency charts.

The Rayleigh energy approach was evaluated with respect to such items as various rotational speeds, higher modes, flapping-hinge or root offset, variable blade mass and stiffness distributions, and a large concentrated tip mass. The evaluation was made by comparing frequency results obtained by the Rayleigh method with results obtained by a more accurate mode-expansion method. The details of the mode-expansion method are given in appendix A.

The charts for frequency estimation were obtained by considering various families of beams with selected mass and stiffness distributions and were derived for both hinged and cantilever beams. The frequencies of both nonrotating and rotating cases may be estimated for (a) beams with and without offset which have mass and stiffness distributions which can be approximated by linear relations and (b) beams with uniform mass and stiffness distributions plus a concentrated mass at the tip.

If the bending frequencies of the nonrotating beams are known, a third set of charts permits the estimation of the bending frequencies of rotating beams with approximately linear stiffness distribution and arbitrary mass distribution.

As an adjunct to the Rayleigh approach utilizing the nonrotating-beam mode shapes, a method is presented in appendix B which permits a fairly accurate determination of the first bending mode and frequency of a rotating or nonrotating hinged beam with a tip mass from a knowledge of the first bending mode of the nonrotating beam without a tip mass.

The report also presents bending-mode results, obtained in conjunction with the frequency determination, which show the effect of the parameters on mode shape. Many of these mode shapes are tabulated in normalized form together with their first and second derivatives, or as mode coefficients (coefficients of an expansion in terms of uniform-beam modes). These results can be used in connection with the modified approach of appendix B or in other analyses.

In order to facilitate the further application of the mode-expansion method to the accurate determination of modes and frequencies of rotating beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions, concentrated tip mass, and offset different from those considered herein, certain integrals which have been evaluated are also presented in tabular form.

## SYMBOLS

$A_{nq}$	mode coefficients for the nth rotating-beam mode (see eq. (A3))
$a$	nonrotating-beam bending frequency coefficient, $\omega_{NR} \sqrt{\frac{m_0 L^4}{EI_0}}$
$b$	rotating-beam bending frequency coefficient, $\omega_R \sqrt{\frac{m_0 L^4}{EI_0}}$
$c$	beam-stiffness-distribution constant (see eq. (A12))
$D_0$	pendulum- or zeroeth-mode coefficient (see appendix B)
$EI(x)$	lengthwise bending stiffness distribution for beam
$EI_0$	bending stiffness of beam at root
$\bar{EI}(\bar{x})$	nondimensional bending stiffness distribution for beam, $EI(\bar{x})/EI_0$
$K$	Southwell coefficient (see eqs. (4) and (5))
$K_0$	zero-offset Southwell coefficient
$K_1$	offset-correction factor for Southwell coefficient
$K_0'$	zero-offset rotating-beam frequency coefficient; found to be essentially independent of beam mass distribution (see eq. (11))
$k$	beam-mass-distribution constant (see eq. (A12))
$L$	beam length, measured from point of root fixity to tip
$m(x)$	lengthwise mass distribution for beam (mass per unit length)
$m_0$	mass per unit length of beam at root
$\bar{m}(\bar{x})$	nondimensional mass distribution for beam, $m(\bar{x})/m_0$
$m_d$	part of beam mass distribution which is continuous (not concentrated)
$M_t$	mass concentrated at tip of beam

$r$	nondimensional tip-mass ratio, $M_t/m_0 L$
$T$	lengthwise distribution of tension force in beam, $T_1(x)\Omega^2$
$T_1$	lengthwise-distribution function for tension force (see eq. (2))
$x$	spanwise coordinate along beam measured from root
$\bar{x}$	nondimensional spanwise coordinate, $x/L$
$Y$	bending mode shape of nonrotating beam
$y$	bending mode shape of rotating beam
$\delta(x-L)$	Dirac delta function
$\delta(\bar{x}-1)$	Dirac delta function in nondimensional coordinates
$e$	offset of hinge or point of fixity from axis of rotation
$\bar{e}$	nondimensional offset, $e/L$
$\eta, \bar{\eta}$	dummy variables for $x$ and $\bar{x}$
$\theta$	characteristic number for nonrotating uniform beam with mass at tip; identical to square root of nonrotating- beam bending frequency coefficient
$\phi$	bending mode shape for nonrotating uniform beam normalized at tip
$\Omega$	rotational speed of beam
$\omega_R$	natural bending frequency of rotating beam
$\omega_{NR}$	natural bending frequency of nonrotating beam
Subscripts:	
$n$	integral number designating natural bending mode of beam
$F$	beam cantilevered or fixed at root
$t$	tip of beam

Primes mean differentiation with respect to  $x$  or  $\bar{x}$  unless indicated otherwise.

## THE RAYLEIGH APPROACH APPLIED TO A ROTATING BEAM

## Description

The problem being treated in this report is a rotating beam vibrating freely in one of its natural bending modes. By equating the kinetic energy at zero displacement to the potential energy of both the bending and centrifugal forces at maximum displacement, the following frequency equation for vibration perpendicular to the plane of rotation can easily be derived:

$$\omega_{R_n}^2 = \frac{\int_0^L EI y_n''^2 dx}{\int_0^L m y_n^2 dx} + \frac{\int_0^L T_1 y_n'^2 dx}{\int_0^L m y_n^2 dx} \Omega^2 \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  refers to the mode under consideration and

$$T_1 = \int_x^L (\eta + e) m d\eta \quad (2)$$

Equation (1) yields an exact value for the  $n$ th bending frequency of a beam rotating at any rotational speed  $\Omega$  if the  $n$ th natural bending mode shape of the rotating beam is known for this value of  $\Omega$ . Unfortunately, the mode shape is usually just as much of an unknown as the frequency is. An estimation of the frequency may be made, however, by making use of the well-known Rayleigh principle; that is, a mode shape which is consistent with the constraints of the system is assumed and is used to evaluate the energy integrals which, in turn, give an approximate value for the frequency. In this report the nonrotating-beam mode shape is chosen as the approximation for the rotating-beam mode shape, and an evaluation is made to show whether the use of such a shape yields close approximations to the exact frequencies of the rotating beam.

If the  $n$ th mode shape of the nonrotating beam  $Y_n$  is substituted into equation (1), the first term becomes exactly the square of the bending frequency of the nonrotating beam. By denoting the ratio in the second term by  $K_n$ , a Southwell coefficient, the frequency equation takes the following simplified form:

$$\omega_{R_n}^2 = \omega_{NR_n}^2 + K_n \Omega^2 \quad (3)$$



where

$$K_n = \frac{\int_0^L Y_n'^2 dx \int_x^L (\eta + e) m d\eta}{\int_0^L m Y_n^2 dx} \quad (4)$$

This expression for  $K_n$  can be subdivided into two independent parts as follows:

$$K_n = K_{0n} + K_{1n} e \quad (5)$$

where both  $K_{0n}$  and  $K_{1n}$  are independent of the offset  $e$  and are defined as follows:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} K_{0n} &= \frac{\int_0^L Y_n'^2 dx \int_x^L \eta m d\eta}{\int_0^L m Y_n^2 dx} \\ K_{1n} &= \frac{\int_0^L Y_n'^2 dx \int_x^L m d\eta}{\int_0^L m Y_n^2 dx} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (6)$$

In the remainder of this report  $K_{0n}$  is referred to as the zero-offset Southwell coefficient and  $K_{1n}$  is referred to as the offset-correction factor for the Southwell coefficient.

It is convenient to write  $\omega_{NRn}^2$  in terms of a nonrotating-beam frequency coefficient  $a_n$  and the mass and stiffness of the beam at the root as

$$\omega_{NR_n}^2 = a_n^2 \frac{EI_0}{m_0 L^4} \quad (7)$$

By means of equations (5) and (7), equation (3) may be written as

$$\omega_{R_n}^2 = a_n^2 \frac{EI_0}{m_0 L^4} + (K_{0_n} + K_{1_n} e) \Omega^2 \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) with  $K_{0_n}$ ,  $K_{1_n}$ , and  $e$  in nondimensional form serves as the basis for the charts for rapid frequency estimation to be presented subsequently in this report. These charts provide values of  $a_n$ ,  $K_{0_n}$ , and  $K_{1_n}$  which, in conjunction with the mass and stiffness of the beam at the root, the length of the beam, the hinge offset, and the rotational speed, permit rapid estimation of the first three bending frequencies of rotating or nonrotating beams.

If the mass distribution of the blade is given by a simple analytic function, the integral expression for  $T_1$  (eq. (2)) can usually be evaluated exactly; for arbitrary mass distribution, however, numerical-integration methods such as are given in reference 15 must be employed. Because of the nature of the numerical-integration procedure used in the present paper, a slightly different form of the expression for  $K_n$  was found to be useful. This form can be obtained by performing an integration by parts on the numerator of equation (4), and in nondimensional form the result appears as

$$\bar{K}_n = \frac{\int_0^1 (\bar{x} + \bar{e}) \bar{m} \, d\bar{x} \int_0^{\bar{x}} \bar{Y}_n'^2 \, d\bar{\eta}}{\int_0^1 \bar{m} \bar{Y}_n^2 \, d\bar{x}} \quad (9)$$

whence the definitions for  $\bar{K}_{0_n}$  and  $\bar{K}_{1_n}$  are evident.

An additional form of equation (3) is now presented for use in subsequent sections of this report. Dividing equation (3) by  $\omega_{NR_n}^2$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left( \frac{\omega_{R_n}}{\omega_{NR_n}} \right)^2 &= 1 + K_n \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR_n}} \right)^2 \\
 &= 1 + K_n \left( \frac{\omega_{NR_1}}{\omega_{NR_n}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR_1}} \right)^2
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

This form of equation (3) was found to be useful in the evaluation of the Rayleigh approach. Hereinafter, in this report  $\omega_{R_n}/\omega_{NR_n}$  is referred to as the frequency parameter and  $\Omega/\omega_{NR_1}$  is referred to as the rotational-speed parameter. Also, for subsequent use in this report, a new zero-offset rotating-beam frequency coefficient  $K_{O_n}'$  is now defined as

$$K_{O_n}' \equiv K_{O_n} \left[ \frac{(\omega_{NR_1})_F}{\omega_{NR_n}} \right]^2 \equiv K_{O_n} \left( \frac{a_{1F}}{a_n} \right)^2 \tag{11}$$

where the subscript F indicates that  $a_1$  is the nonrotating-beam frequency coefficient for the beam cantilevered at the root. All other terms are for the beam with its actual root condition, that is, either cantilevered or hinged.

It is shown subsequently in this report that this new frequency coefficient is insensitive to beam mass distribution and should therefore be useful in estimating bending frequencies for families of beams with similar stiffness distributions. As is apparent from equation (11), the fundamental frequency of the nonrotating beam treated as a cantilever must be known in addition to the bending frequencies of the beam with the actual root condition (cantilevered or hinged).

#### Evaluation of Rayleigh Approach

In order to determine the accuracy, usefulness, and possible limitations of the Rayleigh approach based on nonrotating-beam bending modes, the bending frequencies were calculated by this approach for a series of rotating beams with systematically varied parameters; the frequencies obtained in this manner are compared in this section with the results obtained by the more exact mode-expansion method of appendix A. For the cantilever beams, five uniform-cantilever-beam bending modes were used in

the expansion; for the hinged beams, a pendulum mode was included in addition to five hinged-beam bending modes.

The cases studied by both methods are shown in figure 1. Both cantilever and hinged beams are considered for the following cases:

- (a) Uniform beams with 0- and 10-percent root offset
- (b) Beams with mass and stiffness distributions varying linearly from the root value to zero at the tip and with 0- and 10-percent root offset
- (c) Uniform beams with a mass at the tip.

The results for all the cases treated were obtained in nondimensional form and are presented in plots in which the variation of bending frequencies with rotational speed as predicted by the exact method of appendix A and by the Rayleigh approach may be compared. In each of the figures introduced in this section the abscissa is the squared nondimensional rotational-speed parameter (the squared ratio of rotational speed to the first bending frequency of the nonrotating beam) and the ordinate is the squared nondimensional frequency parameter (the squared ratio of the nth bending frequency of the rotating beam to the nth bending frequency of the nonrotating beam).

The range of the rotational-speed parameter in each case corresponds roughly to that encountered in current helicopters with some latitude for new design. Since the first bending frequency of a hinged beam is roughly four times the first bending frequency of the same beam fixed at the root, widely different scales result for the hinged and cantilever beams. The abscissa range also varied with tip mass because the fundamental frequency of a nonrotating beam decreases with increase in tip mass. For the uniform cantilever beam with a tip mass, this variation is large and thus results in a greatly expanded abscissa scale with each increase in tip mass. For the uniform hinged beam with a tip mass, the effect of tip mass on the nonrotating frequency is relatively small and thus the abscissa range was not extended appreciably with each increase in tip mass.

Hinged beams without tip mass.- The variation of bending frequency with rotational speed for a uniform hinged beam is shown in figure 2 for offsets of 0 and 10 percent. For this case the Rayleigh approach may be seen to be very accurate for all three modes throughout the entire rotational-speed range covered. The maximum error is about 3 percent in the frequency squared and thus only about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent in the frequency. This maximum error occurs at the highest rotational speed and is roughly the same for all three modes.

Frequency results for the hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions are shown in figure 3 for offsets of 0 and 10 percent. From this figure it is evident that the results obtained by the Rayleigh method for this case are very accurate, even for the highest rotational speeds shown.

A comparison of the exact frequency results for the uniform and "linear" hinged beams is presented in figure 4 for the case of zero offset. The difference between the results for the two beams is very marked, particularly for the first mode. One of the most important things to be noted in this comparison is the large difference in slope between the two curves for the first mode. The average slope of each of these lines is directly proportional to the Southwell coefficient for the first mode (see eq. (10)), and the large difference in slope indicates that a single value of this coefficient could not adequately predict the first-mode-frequency variations for both beams. This result contradicts the often made assumption that the Southwell coefficient is largely independent of beam mass and stiffness distribution.

For the higher modes the slope of each of the lines (fig. 4) is also proportional to the Southwell coefficient, but unfortunately each beam has a different constant of proportionality. Thus, it cannot be observed directly from this figure that the Southwell coefficient for the higher modes also varies appreciably with beam characteristics; this fact, however, is evident from the charts for frequency determination to be presented subsequently.

Cantilever beams without tip mass.- The frequency of rotating cantilever beams as well as of hinged beams is of interest in the analysis of a teetering rotor because both symmetrical (cantilever) modes and anti-symmetrical (hinged) modes may be excited. Consequently, in the following paragraphs the Rayleigh approach employed in the present report is evaluated for cantilever beams.

Frequency results for uniform cantilever beams are presented in figure 5. The Rayleigh results are in good agreement with the more exact results for the second and third modes. For the first mode, however, the maximum error is somewhat larger, about 5 percent in the frequency. Nevertheless, the effect of offset on the frequency variation is predicted fairly accurately for all three modes.

For comparison, the results of approximating the first cantilever mode by the pendulum mode of a hinged beam are also given in figure 5. Frequency results based on this shape are seen to be always less than the exact values. As the rotational-speed parameter increases, these results become more and more accurate; for the lower rotational speeds, however, the use of the nonrotating-beam first mode shape yields the most accurate results. The effects of root offset on frequency are predicted by the use of either the pendulum mode or the first cantilever bending mode.

The variation of bending frequency with rotational speed is shown in figure 6 for a cantilever beam with linear mass and stiffness distribution and with offsets of 0 and 10 percent. As is the case for the uniform cantilever, the Rayleigh frequency results, based on the nonrotating-beam cantilever mode, are very accurate for the second and third modes, but are not so accurate for the first mode at the higher values of the rotational-speed parameter; however, the effect of the offset is again predicted fairly accurately.

The Rayleigh results based on a pendulum mode, which are also shown in figure 6, are again seen to be always less than the exact values and to increase in accuracy as the rotational-speed parameter increases. At the lower rotational speeds, however, these results are again appreciably less accurate than those based on the first cantilever bending mode shape. As was the case for the uniform beam, both the pendulum mode and the first cantilever mode predict the effects of the offset equally well.

A comparison of the frequency results for the uniform and "linear" cantilever beams with zero offset is given in figure 7. From the figure it is evident that there is only a small difference in the slope of the exact first-mode frequency curves and thus in the Southwell coefficient for the two beams. This small difference, however, is predicted, although not too accurately, by the Rayleigh approach based on the nonrotating-beam mode shape; whereas, if a pendulum-mode approximation had been used, no difference could have been predicted.

For the higher modes, the effects of mass and stiffness distribution on frequency are more pronounced and lead again to the conclusion that, in general, a single value of the Southwell coefficient cannot accurately predict the frequency variations for beams with appreciably different mass and stiffness distributions.

The error in the first-mode-frequency results obtained by the Rayleigh approach (fig. 7) is almost the same for both beams. Thus, this error apparently is independent of beam mass and stiffness distribution; this observation suggests the possibility of applying a correction, based on the known errors for these particular beams, to the Rayleigh results obtained for cantilever beams with other mass and stiffness distributions.

Cantilever beams with tip mass.— For beams with a mass at the tip, the results for the cantilever case suggest certain simplifications which may be carried over to the hinged beams; thus the cantilever results are discussed first.

The variation of bending frequency with rotational speed for a uniform cantilever beam with a concentrated mass at the tip and zero offset

is given in figure 8. Results are presented for two cases: tip mass equal to the beam mass and tip mass equal to one-half the beam mass. Figure 8 shows that the Rayleigh results are of the same order of accuracy as for the beam without tip mass - very accurate for the second and third modes but relatively less accurate for the first mode.

It is of interest to note that for each mode the variation of the frequency parameter with the rotational-speed parameter is almost identical for the two values of tip mass considered. In fact, if these results are compared with those for the beam with zero tip mass in figure 5, the variation for all three cases is seen to be practically identical.

The foregoing observations create the impression that the zero-offset Southwell coefficient for each mode is independent of the value of the tip mass. This assumption is true for the first mode but is misleading for the higher modes as is evident from equation (10) where it can be seen that a constant of proportionality  $(\omega_{NR_1}/\omega_{NR_n})^2$ , which varies with tip mass, is involved. Nonetheless, inasmuch as this constant of proportionality is defined by a ratio of nonrotating-beam frequencies, a new rotating-beam frequency coefficient, or modified Southwell coefficient  $K_{On}$  can be defined (see eq. (11)) which is essentially independent of tip mass and, as will be shown subsequently, of beam mass distribution as well.

Hinged beams with tip mass.- The variation of bending frequency with rotational speed for a uniform hinged beam with a concentrated mass at its tip and zero offset is given in figure 9. Results are given for two cases: tip mass equal to beam mass and tip mass equal to one-half the beam mass. The Rayleigh results are very accurate for all three modes over the entire range of variables investigated, and it may be inferred, particularly for the first mode, that the Rayleigh procedure will yield reasonably accurate results for appreciably larger values of the rotational-speed parameter and tip mass.

From figure 9 the frequency variation can readily be seen to be considerably different for the two values of tip mass, unlike the cantilever results of figure 8, for which the frequency variation is essentially independent of tip mass. In an attempt to explain this difference between the two cases, the results of figure 9 were replotted in figure 10 as a function of the rotational-speed parameter used for the cantilever cases, that is, the squared ratio of rotational speed to the bending frequency of the beam in the first cantilever mode. From figure 10 the frequency variation with this rotational-speed parameter may be seen to be essentially independent of tip mass, as was noted for the cantilever. Consequently, a new constant which is insensitive to the mass distribution of the beam is suggested. For hinged beams this constant is also defined by equation (11). The invariance of this constant with beam mass distribution is discussed subsequently in this report.

Estimation of fundamental frequency of beam with tip mass.- A method which permits the accurate approximation of the first bending mode shape of a hinged beam with a tip mass from a knowledge of the first mode shape of the beam without a tip mass is presented in appendix B. Once such a shape has been determined, the computation of the nonrotating-beam first-mode frequency and the associated Southwell coefficient is a relatively simple matter. In order to illustrate the accuracy of this procedure, nonrotating-beam bending frequencies and Southwell coefficients were computed for the uniform beam with two values of tip mass and were compared with the values obtained by using the exact nonrotating-beam bending mode shapes.

For the case of a uniform beam with tip mass equal to one-half the beam mass, the nonrotating-beam frequency squared obtained by using the approximate shape was found to be too high by about 2 percent, and the associated Southwell coefficient was found to be too low by about 2 percent. If these errors had both been in the same direction, the first bending frequency of the rotating beam would have differed by only about 1 percent or less from the Rayleigh result based on the exact nonrotating-beam mode shape. However, because the two errors tend to cancel, the difference would be much less.

The results for the case of a tip mass equal to beam mass showed very similar characteristics, although the error in nonrotating-beam frequency was slightly higher.

Although the method of appendix B has been evaluated only for the case of uniform beams, it is believed that the method will be equally accurate for beams with other mass or stiffness distributions.

#### CHARTS FOR BENDING-FREQUENCY DETERMINATION

In the preceding section, the Rayleigh approach was evaluated and the conclusion was reached that Southwell coefficients obtained by using nonrotating-beam mode shapes lead to reasonably accurate bending frequencies of rotating beams, at least for the range of the rotational-speed parameter encountered in helicopter blades. The evaluation also showed that the Southwell coefficients can vary appreciably with beam characteristics. This section describes a group of charts based on the Rayleigh approach which permit the rapid estimation of bending frequencies of rotating and nonrotating beams.



## Rotating and Nonrotating Beams Without Tip Mass

In order to provide a means for the rapid, yet reasonably accurate, estimation of rotor-blade bending frequencies, nonrotating-beam frequency coefficients, zero-offset Southwell coefficients, and offset-correction factors for the Southwell coefficients have been computed for a series of beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions and have been compiled in chart form. The range of mass and stiffness distributions was selected to encompass variations found in currently manufactured blades with some latitude for new design. All the constants are based on the mode shapes of the nonrotating beam, which were obtained by standard numerical-iteration procedures. (See section entitled "Results for Bending Modes" for more details regarding these procedures.)

The form of the Rayleigh energy equation which is used in conjunction with the charts to obtain bending frequencies is equation (8) with  $K_{0n}$ ,  $K_{1n}$ , and  $e$  in nondimensional form:

$$\omega_{Rn}^2 = a_n^2 \frac{EI_0}{m_0 L^4} + \left( \bar{K}_{0n} + \bar{K}_{1n} \bar{e} \right) \Omega^2 \quad (12)$$

where  $\bar{K}_{0n} = K_{0n}$  and  $\bar{K}_{1n} = K_{1n} L$ . The charts for frequency determination are presented in figures 11 to 16. In each chart, the abscissa is the ratio of the beam mass per unit length at the tip of the beam to the mass per unit length at the root; 1.0 represents a constant-mass beam and 0 a beam in which the mass varies linearly to zero at the tip. Curves are presented for three different stiffness variations: the solid curves for beams with constant stiffness, the long-dash curves for beams where the stiffness drops linearly to half the root value at the tip, and the long-dash, short-dash curves for beams which have zero stiffness at the tip.

Each of these curves is faired through only three points, one at each end and one at the middle; for the Southwell coefficients and offset-correction factors, this procedure should involve little error because, in most cases, the variation is nearly linear, but for the frequency coefficients the fairing may appear to be questionable. However, the fairing of these curves was not entirely arbitrary. The fundamental bending frequency of cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions is given in reference 16 for cases in which the mass and stiffness variations are proportional, that is, where

$$\frac{EI_t}{EI_0} = \frac{m_t}{m_0}$$

Two of the cases considered in this reference, namely, the ones where both ratios equal 0 and 1, are identical to cases treated in this report and the results for these are in good agreement. The other cases treated in reference 16, namely, those for which this ratio is 0.2, 0.4, and 0.6, were used in fairing the curves of  $a_1$  for the cantilever case. The other curves for the frequency coefficient for cantilever and hinged beams were then faired by using this first set of curves as a guide.

Charts which permit the rapid estimation of nonrotating-beam frequency coefficients, zero-offset Southwell coefficients, and offset-correction factors for the Southwell coefficients are presented in figures 11 to 13 for beams hinged at the root and in figures 14 to 16 for beams fixed at the root.

Since the zero-offset Southwell coefficient for the pendulum mode is always unity regardless of the mass and stiffness distribution of the beam, it is not included in figure 12. However, the offset-correction factor for this mode is not independent of mass distribution but is independent of stiffness distribution, as indicated in figure 13. The pendulum-mode results in figure 13 are also given in reference 4.

As was mentioned in the section of this report entitled "Evaluation of Rayleigh Approach," the zero-offset Southwell coefficients for the first cantilever mode (given in fig. 15) will yield accurate rotational frequencies only at relatively low values of the rotational-speed parameter and must be corrected in accordance with the results of figure 5 or 6 at higher values of this parameter. A fixed-percentage correction cannot be given because the error is a function of the rotational-speed parameter.

The effect of root fixity on the Southwell coefficients can be noted by comparing the curves of figure 12 with those of figure 15. The first-mode results for the cantilever beams should be compared with the pendulum-mode Southwell coefficient for the hinged beam which is always unity for the case of zero offset. Likewise, the second-mode curves of figure 15 should be compared with the first-mode curves of figure 12, and so forth for the higher modes. From this comparison it is seen that the effects of root fixity on the Southwell coefficients are fairly small and can probably be neglected for rough approximations in all cases, except for the first cantilever mode. With this assumption, the results of figure 12 for the third bending mode can be used as reasonable approximations for the fourth cantilever mode.

The variation of the Southwell coefficient may be seen from figures 12, 13, 15, and 16 to be relatively insensitive to beam stiffness distribution, particularly for cantilever beams but also for the hinged beams. This observation, coupled with the facts that frequency is proportional to the square root of the Southwell coefficient and that the influence of the Southwell coefficient decreases for higher modes (for constant rotational

speed), leads to the conclusion that fairly good approximations to the Southwell coefficients for beams with other than linear stiffness distributions may also be obtainable from this set of charts. The examples presented in the following section appear to bear out this conclusion.

Application of charts to several actual helicopter blades.- To illustrate the use and the type of accuracy which can be expected from the frequency charts of figures 11 to 16 and to demonstrate that the charts work well even when the mass and stiffness distributions of the beams are not exactly linear, bending frequencies have been estimated for the first three modes of four existing helicopter blades, all of which are hinged. The following procedure, which may be made clearer by reference to the sketches in table I, was used in the estimation:

(a) Straight lines were faired through the mass and stiffness distributions for the blade; large values near the root were ignored.

(b) From these fairings, the effective root values  $m_0$  and  $EI_0$  and the necessary tip-root ratios were obtained.

(c) By using these ratios, values of  $a_n$ ,  $K_0$ , and  $\bar{K}_1$  were obtained from the appropriate charts (figs. 11 to 16).

(d) Substitution of these constants and  $\bar{e}$  into the Rayleigh equation (eq. (12)) yielded the bending frequencies at zero and the rated rotor speed.

The mass and stiffness distributions for the blades considered are shown on the left side of table I. The actual distribution is given by the solid lines, and the linear approximation, selected to represent this variation, is given by the dashed lines. These linear approximations used in estimating the frequencies were the initial ones selected, and no attempt was made to improve them in order to obtain the best agreement for all modes. The frequencies shown as "exact" in table I are values furnished by the manufacturer.

A comparison of the exact and estimated results given in table I for these blades indicates that the estimated results are very accurate when the crudeness of the linear approximations used is considered.

Although no comparisons have been made for cantilever blades because sufficient information regarding such blades was not available, even more accurate results should be obtainable for this end condition since large values of root stiffness can be taken into account more accurately by considering the blade to be cantilevered at the outboard edge of the stiff region and then using the offset-correction factor for the Southwell coefficients.

## Beams With a Mass at the Tip

Uniform cantilever beam.- Expressions defining the bending frequencies and mode shapes of nonrotating uniform cantilever beams with a tip mass equal to a fraction  $r$  of the beam mass are given in reference 17. These expressions, in somewhat simpler form, are the following: the defining relation for the frequencies is

$$1 + \cos \theta \cosh \theta - r\theta(\sin \theta \cosh \theta - \cos \theta \sinh \theta) = 0 \quad (13)$$

where

$$\omega_{NR_n} = \theta_n^2 \sqrt{\frac{EI}{mL^4}}$$

and the mode shapes are

$$y_n(x) = \sinh x - \sin x + (\cos x - \cosh x) \frac{\sinh \theta_n + \sin \theta_n}{\cosh \theta_n + \cos \theta_n} \quad (14)$$

In addition to the defining relation for the frequency, reference 17 also gives values of  $\theta_n$  for the first three modes of cantilevers and for several values of  $r$ . Some of these results, which are pertinent to helicopter blades, are plotted in figure 17. Values of  $\theta_n^2$  rather than  $\theta_n$  are plotted, because  $\theta_n^2$  is directly proportional to frequency and corresponds to the nonrotating frequency coefficients  $a_n$  presented previously.

For larger values of  $r$  fairly accurate values of  $\theta_n^2$  can be obtained from the following approximate expression:

$$\theta_n^2 \approx \left( \theta_n^2 \right)_{r=0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{1 + \kappa_n r}} \quad (15)$$

where  $\kappa_n$  is a constant for each mode which can be determined from the frequency results for the largest value of  $r$  - in this case, 2. Equation (15) can also be used for nonuniform beams and for hinged as well as cantilever beams.

The variation of the Southwell zero-offset coefficient with tip mass is given in figure 18 for the first three modes of a uniform cantilever beam. These results were computed by using the mode shape of the nonrotating beam presented in equation (14); the integrations were performed analytically. Although only three points were used to establish each curve of figure 18, the fairing should be quite accurate since the variations shown are almost linear.

The Southwell coefficients of figure 18, in conjunction with the nonrotating-beam frequency coefficients of figure 17, should permit very accurate estimates for the bending frequencies of rotating uniform beams with a tip mass except possibly for the first mode, for which a correction may be made in accordance with results given in figure 8 for large values of the rotational-speed parameter.

The effect of root offset has not been studied for this case, but offset-correction factors can be obtained from the mode shapes defined by equation (14).

Uniform hinged beam.- By using the method of reference 17, expressions defining the bending frequencies and mode shapes of nonrotating uniform hinged beams with a mass at the tip have been determined. The defining relation for the frequency is

$$2r\theta + \coth \theta - \cot \theta = 0 \quad (16)$$

and the mode shapes are given by

$$y_n(x) = \sinh x + \frac{\sinh \theta_n}{\sin \theta_n} \sin x \quad (17)$$

Values of  $\theta_n$  have been determined for several values of  $r$ ; these results are given in figure 19 as frequency coefficients  $\theta_n^2$ , together with the frequency coefficients for the case of zero tip mass.

By using the nonrotating-beam mode shape, given by equation (17), values for the zero-offset Southwell coefficient have been determined for hinged beams with a tip mass and are given in figure 20. For the pendulum mode,  $K_0$  is always unity and therefore is not shown. The results in figures 19 and 20 together permit the rapid estimation of the bending frequencies of rotating uniform hinged beams with a mass at the tip.

Pendulum-mode results for hinged beams with linear mass distributions.- The zero-offset Southwell coefficient for the pendulum mode of a hinged beam is equal to unity, regardless of the mass or stiffness distribution of the beam. For the case of hinge offset, however, the Southwell coefficient is independent of stiffness distribution but varies considerably with beam mass distribution and with the tip mass. A chart (see fig. 21) has been prepared which permits the rapid estimation of the offset-correction factor to the Southwell coefficient for hinged beams with an approximately linear mass distribution plus a mass at the tip.

First bending mode frequency of nonuniform hinged beam.- A simple method is indicated in appendix B for obtaining an approximate first mode shape for any beam with a tip mass from a knowledge of the beam mode shape without a tip mass. Once such a shape is determined, the fundamental bending frequencies of the rotating and nonrotating beams can be determined very easily by application of the Rayleigh frequency equation (eq. (1)).

#### Rotating Beams With Nonlinear Mass Distribution and Approximately Linear Stiffness Distribution

In the section of this report concerned with the evaluation of the Rayleigh approach, a modified form of the zero-offset Southwell coefficient  $K_{0n}'$  was shown to be insensitive to variations in beam tip mass.

This coefficient is defined for both cantilever and hinged beams by equation (11).

In order to determine whether this new coefficient is also insensitive to other variations in beam mass distribution, all values of  $K_{0n}$  presented in the charts for rapid frequency estimation were converted to  $K_{0n}'$ . For each stiffness distribution  $K_{0n}'$  was found to be almost constant for each mode, the differences being of the same order of magnitude as the errors inherent in the Rayleigh approach used herein.

To facilitate the estimation of bending frequencies for rotating beams with large tip masses or possibly other nonlinear mass distributions, values of  $K_{0n}'$  for all the beams treated in the present report are plotted in figure 22(a) for cantilever beams and in figure 22(b) for hinged beams. Curves have been faired through the points to give average values for  $K_{0n}'$  and thus for  $K_{0n}$  for beams with approximately linear stiffness distributions and with any mass distribution. In analyzing

these results, the facts that frequency is a function of the square root of  $K_{O_n}$  and that the influence of  $K_{O_n}$  on frequency decreases with increase in mode number should be kept in mind.

From equation (11) it is apparent that the first bending frequency of the nonrotating beam cantilevered at the root and the  $n$ th bending frequency of the nonrotating beam with its actual end fixity are required to determine  $K_{O_n}$  (and thus the bending frequency of the rotating beam) from a knowledge of  $K_{O_n}'$ . In spite of this complication, however, the charts presented should be useful in design studies involving rotating beams with nonlinear mass distributions but with approximately linear stiffness distributions. It should be emphasized at this point that the constancy of  $K_{O_n}'$  has been demonstrated for only a limited variety of mass distributions, and thus application to blades having mass distributions radically different from those considered in this report should be made with caution.

#### Rotating Beams With Mass and Stiffness Distributions

##### Not Representable by Foregoing Approximations

The charts presented in this report permit the rapid estimation of bending frequencies for rotating beams with a mass and stiffness distribution each of which can be reasonably approximated by a straight line and for uniform beams with a tip mass; also the charts facilitate the estimation of bending frequencies for rotating beams with fairly arbitrary mass distributions and approximately linear stiffness distributions. For other cases, for example, beams in which the stiffness varies irregularly all along the blade, the basic Rayleigh energy method utilizing the modes of the nonrotating beam may be used. Although this method has been evaluated in this report only for linear distributions of mass and stiffness and concentrated tip mass, there is no reason to believe that it will not work equally well for other distributions. All that is required in this approach is the frequency and mode of the nonrotating beam, which can be determined by methods such as are described in references 2 and 15. (A method which gives directly the required first derivative of the mode as well as the mode shape itself is preferable.) With such results the integrals of equation (1) can be evaluated readily by accurate numerical methods such as those of reference 15, and values can be obtained for the Southwell coefficient from which the bending frequencies at any rotational speed can be determined with little effort.

## Mode-Expansion Method

A more accurate mode-expansion method for determining the bending frequencies and modes of a rotating or nonrotating beam has been developed in appendix B and has been used as a yardstick in the evaluation of the Rayleigh approach. In this approach the lowest three bending modes and frequencies are obtained by the solution of a fifth-order determinantal equation for cantilever beams and a sixth-order equation for hinged beams. In order to facilitate the further application of this method to the accurate determination of the modes and frequencies of rotating and nonrotating beams, certain integrals which have been evaluated are presented in table II. These results permit the setting up of frequency determinants for beams with any combination of linear mass and stiffness distribution, concentrated tip mass, offset, and rotational speed (including many combinations not treated herein). With the evaluation of additional integrals (some of which are given in ref. 18), these results can be used to determine the bending frequencies and modes for rotating and nonrotating beams with concentrated mass at other locations or with higher order mass and stiffness distributions. If practice dictates the necessity of additional charts for other combinations of linear mass and stiffness distribution and tip mass or for parabolic beam mass and stiffness distributions, it might be advantageous to use this method to set up such charts if high-speed computing machines suitable for solving the determinantal equations are available.

Vibration in Planes Other Than Those Perpendicular  
to Plane of Rotation

The frequency charts and procedures for frequency determination of this report have all been directed toward the determination of frequencies for uncoupled bending vibrations perpendicular to the plane of rotation. In cases where the principal axis of the blade cross sections (axis about which the stiffness is a minimum) is not parallel to the plane of rotation, natural bending vibrations having the lowest frequency will take place perpendicular to the chord. An extreme case of such vibrations would occur if the blade chord were perpendicular to the plane of rotation, in which case, blade vibrations would take place in the plane of rotation.

Frequencies of vibration, when the blade chord is inclined at any angle  $\psi$  with the plane of rotation, can be determined from the frequencies of vibration perpendicular to the plane of rotation by means of a simple formula proposed in reference 19: namely,

$$\omega_{R\psi}^2 = \omega_{RL}^2 - \Omega^2 \sin^2 \psi$$



where  $\omega_{R_L}$  is the frequency of bending vibrations perpendicular to the plane of rotation and  $\omega_{R_\psi}$  is the frequency for bending vibrations in a plane making an angle  $\psi$  with the axis of rotation.

At large angles of attack, the indicated correction may be significant for the lower modes. However, inasmuch as  $\omega_{R_L}^2$  is usually 5 to 10 times as large as  $\Omega^2$  for the lowest bending mode of helicopter blades and even larger for the higher modes, in most cases the angle of attack of the blade will have little effect on bending frequency and may be disregarded. This fact is significant since it indicates that blade frequency will not change appreciably during each revolution because of cyclic-pitch changes and thus may be assumed to be constant.

## RESULTS FOR BENDING MODES

In the process of obtaining the frequency results presented in the preceding sections of this paper, a large number of mode shapes of both rotating and nonrotating beams with various mass and stiffness distributions were determined. These results are presented in tabular form in order to make them more useful in analytical studies and are compared in this section with each other in order to show the effect of the various parameters on mode shape.

### Nonrotating Beams

The first three mode shapes for nine nonrotating cantilever and nine nonrotating hinged beams with different combinations of linear mass and stiffness distributions are given in tables III and IV, together with their first and second derivatives. These results were obtained by standard numerical-iteration procedures. For the cantilever beams (table III), the procedure of reference 15 was used with 10 stations; step-integration procedures were used for the first mode, and equivalent-load methods were used for the second and third modes. For the hinged beams (table IV), a matrix-iteration procedure using weighted integration matrices similar to those given in reference 21 was employed with 15 stations. More stations were needed for the hinged beams than for the cantilever beams because the third hinged mode has one more loop or node than the third cantilever mode.

In order to illustrate the accuracy of the nonrotating mode shapes computed by this method, the exact results given for the uniform beam in reference 20 are also included in tables III and IV. A comparison of the results indicates that the error of the present results is less than 1 percent. Nonrotating mode shapes are shown for the hinged beams in figure 23 and for the cantilever beams in figure 24.

### Rotating Beams

The mode and frequency results for rotating beams were obtained in the present paper by the method of appendix A. This method yields mode coefficients which, when multiplied by the mode shapes of nonrotating uniform beams normalized to positive tip values and summed, give the mode shapes of the rotating beam. These coefficients can also be used in conjunction with the spanwise derivatives of the uniform-beam mode shapes to obtain similar derivatives for the rotating beams. The required uniform-beam modes and derivatives are given in reference 20, but they are not all normalized to positive tip deflections and thus certain sign modifications are necessary. These modes and the first two derivatives are also given in tables III and IV with the proper signs and tip deflections.

All the mode coefficients for rotating beams obtained in the present investigation are given in tables V and VI. These coefficients have been normalized in such a manner that the modes obtained by using them will have the same tip deflection as the uniform-beam modes used in the computation. Table V contains the results for the hinged beams, whereas table VI contains those for the cantilever beams.

### Comparison of Rotating and Nonrotating Beams

Hinged beams.— The mode shapes of a uniform hinged beam for zero rotational speed and a rotational speed  $\Omega$  equal to the first bending frequency  $\omega_{NR_1}$  are shown in figure 25. A comparison of these shapes indicates that although some differences between the modes exist, they are relatively small, particularly for the higher modes.

A similar comparison is given in figure 26 for hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions, both zero at the tip. For this case the difference in mode shapes is very small for all three modes; this undoubtedly accounts for the fact that the Rayleigh approach was found to be very accurate for this case. (See fig. 3.)

By comparing the results of figures 25 and 26, a large disagreement may be noted between the mode shapes of the two beams; this disparity apparently accounts for the substantial differences in the Southwell coefficients for the two beams.

The calculated mode shapes have not been plotted in a form which shows the effect of offset on the mode shapes of rotating beams; but by comparing the mode coefficients for 0- and 10-percent offsets in table V, the effect may be seen to be small.

Cantilever beams.- The modes of rotating and nonrotating uniform cantilever beams are shown in figure 27. From the figure the mode shapes, particularly those for the first and second modes, may be seen to change appreciably with rotational speed.

A similar comparison can be made for cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions on the basis of the results shown in figure 28. The mode shapes vary in about the same manner with rotational speed for this type of beam as for the uniform beam.

If the mode coefficients for 0- and 10-percent offsets in table VI are compared, the effect of offset on mode shape is again seen to be very small for both beams.

Beams with a mass at tip.- Bending mode shapes for a rotating and a nonrotating uniform hinged beam with a mass at the tip equal to the beam mass are shown in figure 29. The differences in mode shape are very small for all three modes. This similarity apparently accounts for the excellent accuracy of the Rayleigh approach for this configuration.

Similar results for a uniform cantilever beam with a mass at the tip equal to the beam mass are presented in figure 30. For this case, results are given for three values of the rotational-speed parameter, namely,

$$\frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} = 0, 10.43, \text{ and } 14.76, \text{ and also for the nonrotating uniform beam}$$

without tip mass. From this figure the rotating-beam mode shapes may be seen to be only slightly different from each other but considerably different from the nonrotating shape, particularly for the first and second modes, and vastly different from the mode shape of the beam without a tip mass.

Mode coefficients for rotating uniform hinged and cantilever beams with a mass at the tip are listed in tables V and VI. Mode shapes for nonrotating uniform beams with a mass at the tip have not been tabulated but can be calculated by means of equations (14) and (17) for any value of tip mass.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

A Rayleigh energy approach, which utilizes the mode shape of the nonrotating beam as an approximation for the mode shape of the rotating beam in the determination of the bending frequencies of the rotating beam, has been evaluated. The evaluation led to the conclusion that this approach yields reasonably accurate bending frequencies for rotating hinged and cantilever beams with arbitrary stiffness and mass distributions, including concentrated masses, at least within the limits of the

rotational speeds currently encountered by helicopter blades. The evaluation also showed that the Southwell coefficients vary appreciably with beam mass distribution and, to a less extent, with beam stiffness distribution. A modified form of the zero-offset Southwell coefficient, which involves the nonrotating-beam frequencies, was found to be insensitive to changes in beam mass distribution.

By using the Rayleigh approach as a basis, several groups of charts and associated procedures have been presented, which permit the rapid estimation of the first three bending frequencies for a variety of rotating and nonrotating hinged and cantilever beams. Since the charts are not applicable to all beams, practice may dictate the need for additional charts which may be set up by using the methods described. The charts and associated procedures presented in this report are summarized below, the most easily applied being listed first:

(a) Charts are presented which permit the rapid estimation of bending frequencies of rotating and nonrotating beams with mass and stiffness distributions, each of which can be approximated by a linear relation. In example applications, this procedure has been shown to give good results for the bending frequencies of several actual helicopter blades with mass and stiffness distributions appreciably different from linear.

(b) Charts are presented for rapidly estimating the effects of tip mass on the rotating and nonrotating bending frequencies of uniform beams.

(c) A chart is presented which permits the rapid estimation of the effects of offset on the pendulum frequency of hinged beams with any stiffness distribution, an approximately linear mass distribution, and a concentrated tip mass.

(d) A simplified procedure is presented for estimating the first bending mode and frequency of a rotating or nonrotating hinged beam with a tip mass from a knowledge of the first mode shape of the nonrotating beam without a tip mass.

(e) Charts for a modified Southwell coefficient, which appears to be insensitive to changes in beam mass distribution, are presented; these charts permit the rapid estimation of the first three bending frequencies of rotating beams with approximately linear stiffness distributions from a knowledge of the bending frequencies of the nonrotating beam.

(f) Bending frequencies for beams with unusual mass and stiffness distributions which cannot be estimated by using the charts can be determined directly from the Rayleigh energy equation by first calculating the bending frequencies and associated mode shapes of the nonrotating beams. This approach can be expected to yield results which are in error by less (usually much less) than 3 percent, except for the first cantilever frequency which may be in error by as much as 5 percent but which can easily

be corrected to give a much more accurate result. The method has the advantage over other simplified approaches of improved accuracy and wider applicability and over more exact approaches of simplicity and flexibility.

A more accurate mode-expansion method for determining the bending frequencies and modes of a rotating or a nonrotating beam has been developed and has been used to evaluate the Rayleigh approach. In order to facilitate the further application of this method to the accurate determination of modes and frequencies of rotating and nonrotating beams with combinations of linear mass and stiffness distribution and concentrated tip mass different from those considered herein, certain integrals which have been evaluated are presented in tabular form.

In conjunction with obtaining the frequency results which comprise the greater part of this report, bending mode shapes were determined for a wide variety of hinged and cantilever beams. These results show the effect of rotational speed, mass and stiffness distributions, offset, root fixity, and other parameters on bending mode shape; they have been tabulated in normalized form together with their first and second derivatives or as mode coefficients which, in conjunction with tabulated modes and derivatives of uniform beams, permit the rapid determination of the mode shape and higher derivatives as well. The tabulated results should prove useful in other analyses, for example, in the simplified approach presented in an appendix.

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory,  
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,  
Langley Field, Va., February 24, 1955.

## APPENDIX A

## SOLUTION OF DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION FOR ROTATING BEAM

## BY EXPANSION IN TERMS OF NORMAL MODES OF

## UNIFORM NONROTATING BEAM

## Solution by Galerkin Method

The equation of motion which defines the bending vibrations perpendicular to the plane of rotation of a rotating beam with a concentrated mass at its tip can be written as

$$\frac{d^2}{dx^2} \left( EI \frac{d^2 y_n}{dx^2} \right) = m \omega_{R_n}^2 y_n + M_t \omega_{R_n}^2 y_n(L) \delta(x-L) + \frac{d}{dx} \left( T \frac{dy_n}{dx} \right) \quad (A1)$$

where

$$\delta(x-L) = 0 \quad (x \neq L)$$

$$\delta(x-L) = \frac{1}{L} \quad (x = L)$$

and

$$T = \Omega^2 \left[ \int_x^L (\eta + e) m \, d\eta + M_t(L + e) \right]$$

or, in nondimensional form,

$$\frac{d^2}{d\bar{x}^2} \left( \bar{EI} \frac{d^2 y_n}{d\bar{x}^2} \right) = b_n \bar{m} y_n + r b_n^2 \delta(\bar{x}-1) y_n(1) + \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 \frac{d}{d\bar{x}} \left( \bar{T}_1 \frac{dy_n}{d\bar{x}} \right) \quad (A2)$$

where

$$\delta(\bar{x}-1) = 0 \quad (\bar{x} \neq 1)$$

$$\delta(\bar{x}-1) = 1 \quad (\bar{x} = 1)$$

and

$$\bar{T}_1 = \int_{\bar{x}}^1 (\bar{\eta} + \bar{e}) \bar{m}(\bar{\eta}) d\bar{\eta} + r(1 + \bar{e})$$

$$b_n^2 = \omega_{Rn}^2 \frac{m_0 L^4}{EI_0}$$

Each normal mode of the rotating beam can be expanded in terms of the modes of a uniform nonrotating beam with the same end restraints as follows:

$$y_n = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q \quad (A3)$$

where the quantities  $\phi_q$  are the normalized bending mode shapes of a stationary uniform beam, and the coefficients  $A_{nq}$  are undetermined.

Substituting this expansion into equation (A2) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{d\bar{x}^2} \left[ \frac{\bar{m}}{EI} \frac{d^2}{d\bar{x}^2} \left( \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q \right) \right] - b_n^2 \bar{m} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q - r b_n^2 \delta(\bar{x}-1) \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q(1) - \\ \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 \frac{d}{d\bar{x}} \left[ \bar{T}_1 \frac{d}{d\bar{x}} \left( \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q \right) \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (A4)$$

One way of determining the coefficients  $A_{nq}$  from this equation is the Galerkin procedure which consists in multiplying the equation by  $\phi_p$  and integrating over the length of the beam. Thus,

$$\int_0^1 \phi_p \frac{d^2}{d\bar{x}^2} \left[ \bar{EI} \frac{d^2}{d\bar{x}^2} \left( \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q \right) \right] d\bar{x} - b_n^2 \int_0^1 \bar{m} \phi_p \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q d\bar{x} -$$

$$rb_n^2 \phi_p(1) \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q(1) - \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 \int_0^1 \phi_p \frac{d}{d\bar{x}} \left[ \bar{T}_1 \frac{d}{d\bar{x}} \left( \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q \right) \right] d\bar{x} = 0$$

(A5)

Integrating the first term in equation (A5) by parts twice and the last term by parts once and making use of the known boundary conditions gives for either a cantilever or a hinged beam:

$$\int_0^1 \phi_p \bar{EI} \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q'' d\bar{x} - b_n^2 \int_0^1 \bar{m} \phi_p \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q d\bar{x} -$$

$$rb_n^2 \phi_p(1) \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q(1) + \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 \int_0^1 \phi_p' \bar{T}_1 \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q' d\bar{x} = 0 \quad (A6)$$

where the primes designate differentiations with respect to  $\bar{x}$ . Interchanging the order of integration and summation yields:

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \int_0^1 \bar{EI} \phi_p'' \phi_q d\bar{x} - b_n^2 \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \int_0^1 \bar{m} \phi_p \phi_q d\bar{x} -$$

$$rb_n^2 \phi_p(1) \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \phi_q(1) + \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \int_0^1 \bar{T}_1 \phi_p' \phi_q' d\bar{x} = 0 \quad (A7)$$



Equation (A7) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} \left[ I_{qp} - b_n^2 (M_{qp} + R_{qp}) + \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 S_{qp} \right] = 0 \quad (A8)$$

in terms of a new set of constants: namely,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} I_{qp} &= \int_0^1 \bar{E} \bar{I}_p \phi_q'' \phi_q'' d\bar{x} \\ M_{qp} &= \int_0^1 \bar{m} \phi_p \phi_q d\bar{x} \\ R_{qp} &= r \phi_p(1) \phi_q(1) \\ S_{qp} &= \int_0^1 \bar{T}_1 \phi_p' \phi_q' d\bar{x} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (A9)$$

These coefficients are symmetric; that is,  $I_{qp} = I_{pq}$ , and so forth.

For practical purposes, the expansion must be limited to a finite number of nonrotating uniform-beam modes. In this case the summation goes from  $q = 0$  to  $m$  and equation (A8) yields  $m + 1$  equations of the form

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} A_{nq} B_{qp} = 0$$

where

$$B_{qp} = I_{qp} - b_n^2 (M_{qp} + R_{qp}) + \left( \frac{\Omega}{\omega_{NR1}} \right)^2 a_1^2 S_{qp} \quad (A10)$$

so that the coefficients  $B_{qp}$  are also symmetric.

The modes and frequencies of the system represented by this group of equations can be obtained for any value of the rotational-speed parameter  $\Omega/\omega_{NR1}$  by equating the following determinant of the multipliers  $B_{qp}$  of the mode coefficients  $A_{nq}$  to zero:

$$\begin{vmatrix} B_{00} & B_{01} & B_{02} & \dots & B_{0m} \\ B_{10} & B_{11} & B_{12} & \dots & B_{1m} \\ B_{20} & B_{21} & B_{22} & \dots & B_{2m} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \dots & \cdot \\ B_{m0} & B_{m1} & B_{m2} & \dots & B_{mm} \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (\text{All})$$

This determinantal equation can be solved by trial and error, with any method of evaluating determinants, such as Crout's, to obtain the frequency coefficients  $b_n$  and subsequently the associated mode coefficients  $A_{nq}$  for a rotating beam. The resonant frequencies for  $1p$ ,  $2p$ , or  $np$  resonant conditions can also be obtained directly from the determinant. For small values of  $\Omega/\omega_{NR1}$  less than about 0.8, solutions can also be obtained by the matrix-iteration procedure; for larger values, however, convergence is poor, and undesired negative values of the frequency squared (imaginary frequencies) may be encountered before the desired positive values are obtained. In the present investigation the frequency determinants (eq. (All)) were solved by trial-and-error methods with automatic computing machines of the punchcard type.

For the case of a beam without a tip mass,  $r = 0$ , and thus  $R_{qp}$  is not needed and  $S_{qp}$  is simplified slightly. If, in addition, the beam is uniform,  $I_{qp}$  and  $M_{qp}$  are zero by orthogonality for  $q \neq p$ ; thus for this case the unknown frequency coefficients  $b_n$  occur only on the principal diagonal. If the determinantal equation is divided by  $(\Omega/\omega_{NR1})^2$ , then for this case the rotational-speed parameter also appears only in the terms on the principal diagonal.

### Evaluation of the Integrals $I_{qp}$ , $M_{qp}$ , $R_{qp}$ , and $S_{qp}$

The integrals  $I_{qp}$ ,  $M_{qp}$ ,  $R_{qp}$ , and  $S_{qp}$  may be evaluated numerically by a method such as that given in reference 15, or, if the mass and stiffness distributions of the beams are defined by analytical expressions, they can sometimes be evaluated in closed form. (See ref. 1, pp. 333-336, for instance.) In some cases integrals already evaluated and tabulated in reference 18 can be employed; these results, converted to the coordinate system and tip deflection of the present paper, were employed wherever possible in the present study. In this report all integrals for the uniform rotating beams with and without a tip mass were evaluated by exact methods. Some were also evaluated by numerical methods in order to determine how many stations were required to obtain good accuracy. By this procedure about 25 stations were found to be required for some of the integrals involving the fourth and fifth modes.

For the nonuniform rotating beams,  $I_{qp}$ ,  $M_{qp}$ , and  $R_{qp}$  were evaluated both exactly and numerically, but  $S_{qp}$  was evaluated only numerically because of the effort involved in evaluating this integral exactly. All the integrations performed in this report are based on mode shapes normalized to unity at the tip. Where numerical integrations were made, the mode shapes and derivatives were obtained from reference 20, but the results were modified to correspond to shapes with a unit positive tip deflection.

The remainder of this appendix is devoted to the presentation of results (in both numerical and analytical form) for  $I_{qp}$ ,  $M_{qp}$ ,  $R_{qp}$ , and  $S_{qp}$  which were obtained in connection with the present study but which are also applicable to cases not treated in this report.

Numerical results for beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions with or without tip mass and offset. - If only linear variations in beam mass and stiffness are considered and if they are expressed as

$$\left. \begin{aligned} m &= m_0(1 - k\bar{x}) \\ EI &= EI_0(1 - c\bar{x}) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (A12)$$

then the various integrals can be evaluated expeditiously by splitting them up as indicated in the following equations:

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
 S_{pq} &= S_{pq_0} - kS_{pq_k} + \bar{e}(S_{pq_e} - kS_{pq_{ke}}) + r(1 + \bar{e})S_{pq_t} \\
 I_{qp} &= I_{qp_0} - cI_{qp_c} \\
 M_{qp_k} &= M_{qp_0} - kM_{qp_k} \\
 R_{qp} &= r
 \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (A13)$$

where, in turn,

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
 S_{pq_0} &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 (1 - \bar{x}^2) \phi_p' \phi_q' d\bar{x} \\
 S_{pq_k} &= \frac{1}{3} \int_0^1 (1 - \bar{x}^3) \phi_p' \phi_q' d\bar{x} \\
 S_{pq_e} &= \int_0^1 (1 - \bar{x}) \phi_p' \phi_q' d\bar{x} \\
 S_{pq_{ke}} &= S_{pq_0} \\
 S_{pq_t} &= \int_0^1 \phi_q' \phi_p' d\bar{x} \\
 I_{qp_0} &= \int_0^1 \phi_q'' \phi_p'' d\bar{x} \\
 I_{qp_c} &= \int_0^1 \bar{x} \phi_p'' \phi_q'' d\bar{x} \\
 M_{qp_0} &= \int_0^1 \phi_q \phi_p d\bar{x} \\
 M_{qp_k} &= \int_0^1 \bar{x} \phi_q \phi_p d\bar{x}
 \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (A14)$$

All these integrals are obviously symmetric in  $p$  and  $q$ . Numerical values for them are given in table II for values of  $p$  and  $q$  from 0 to 5 for hinged beams and 1 to 5 for cantilever beams. As may be seen from equations (A13), these results permit the rapid calculation of the terms of a frequency determinant for a rotating beam with any combination of the following parameters: (a) linear mass distribution, (b) linear stiffness distribution, (c) any offset (including large values), and (d) any tip mass. In addition, the results can be used in conjunction with values of additional integrals to set up similar determinants for beams with higher order mass and stiffness distributions and beams with concentrated masses at other locations.

Integrals for uniform beams with tip mass.- In order to facilitate the extension of the results for the uniform rotating beams to higher modes, the exact expressions for integrals pertinent to such cases are included herein.

The integrals for the cases where  $p = q$  can also be used to determine values for Southwell coefficients for modes higher than the third. The integrals were evaluated by the method of reference 1 or taken from reference 18 and transformed into the notation of this report. The expressions are given in terms of the parameters  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\beta_s$ , and  $\gamma_s$ ; values of the first two can be obtained from reference 20 for values of  $s$  from 1 to 5. For  $s > 5$ ,  $\alpha_s = 1$  for all practical purposes and  $\beta_s$  can be obtained from the appropriate frequency equation for the nonrotating uniform beam. The square of  $\beta_s$  is the frequency coefficient for the nonrotating beam  $a_s$  for the  $s$ th bending mode of a uniform beam. Values of  $\gamma_s$  are not required for the cantilever beams; for hinged beams,  $\gamma_s = 1$  for  $s > 3$ ; the values for  $s \leq 3$  are given in the following table:

$s$	$\gamma_s$
1	1.02827
2	1.00121
3	1.00005

Tension integrals  $S_{qp}$  for cantilever beams:

If  $p \neq q$ ,

$$S_{qp} = \frac{\beta_q^2 \beta_p^2}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \left( \left[ \frac{1}{2} (-1)^{p+q} (\alpha_p \beta_p - \alpha_q \beta_q) - \frac{4 \beta_q^2 \beta_p^2}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \right] + \right. \\ \left. \bar{e} \left\{ (-1)^{p+q} \left[ \alpha_p \beta_p - \alpha_q \beta_q + \frac{2(\beta_q^4 + \beta_p^4)}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \right] - \frac{4 \beta_q^2 \beta_p^2}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \right\} + \right. \\ \left. \frac{r(1 + \bar{e})}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \left\{ \alpha_p \beta_p [\beta_q^4 + (-1)^{p+q} \beta_p^2 \beta_q^2] - \alpha_q \beta_q [\beta_p^4 + (-1)^{p+q} \beta_p^2 \beta_q^2] \right\} \right)$$

If  $p = q$ ,

$$S_{qq} = \alpha_q \beta_q \left( \frac{\alpha_q \beta_q}{12} - \frac{1}{8} \right) + \frac{5}{16} + \bar{e} \left[ \alpha_q \beta_q \left( \frac{\alpha_q \beta_q}{8} + \frac{1}{4} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right] + \\ r(1 + \bar{e}) \left( \frac{1}{4} \alpha_q^2 \beta_q^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_q \beta_q \right)$$

Tension integrals  $S_{qp}$  for hinged beams:

If  $p \neq q \neq 0$ ,

$$S_{qp} = -\frac{4\beta_q^4\beta_p^4}{(\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4)^2} - \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \left[ \frac{4\beta_q^4\beta_p^4}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} - (-1)^{p+q} \frac{\beta_p\beta_q^3}{2\gamma_p} \left( 1 + \frac{4\beta_p^4}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \right) + \right. \\ \left. (-1)^{p+q} \frac{\beta_q\beta_p^3\gamma_p}{2\gamma_q} \left( 1 - \frac{4\beta_q^4}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} \right) \right] + \frac{r(1 + \bar{\epsilon})}{\beta_q^4 - \beta_p^4} (\beta_p\alpha_p\beta_q^4 - \beta_q\alpha_q\beta_p^4)$$

If  $p \neq q$ , but  $p = 0$ ,

$$S_{q0} = \bar{\epsilon}(-1)^q \frac{\gamma_q}{\beta_q\sqrt{2}} + r(1 + \bar{\epsilon})$$

If  $p = q \neq 0$ ,

$$S_{qq} = \frac{1}{12} \beta_q^2 \alpha_q^2 + \frac{5}{16} + \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{8} (\beta_q^2 \alpha_q^2 + 3) + r(1 + \bar{\epsilon}) \left( \frac{1}{4} \beta_q^2 \alpha_q^2 + \frac{3}{4} \beta_q \alpha_q \right)$$

If  $p = q = 0$ ,

$$S_{00} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{2} + r(1 + \bar{\epsilon})$$

Stiffness integrals  $I_{qp}$  for cantilever or hinged beams:

If  $q \neq p$ ,

$$I_{qp} = 0$$

If  $p = q \neq 0$ ,

$$I_{qq} = \frac{\beta_q^4}{4}$$

If  $p = q = 0$ ,

$$I_{00} = 0$$

Mass integrals  $M_{qp}$  for cantilever or hinged beams:

If  $p \neq q$ ,

$$M_{qp} = 0$$

If  $p = q \neq 0$ ,

$$M_{qq} = \frac{1}{4}$$

If  $p = q = 0$ ,

$$M_{00} = \frac{1}{3}$$

Tip-mass integrals for cantilever or hinged beams:

If  $p = q$ , or  $p \neq q$ ,

$$R_{qp} = r$$



## APPENDIX B

AN APPROXIMATE METHOD OF OBTAINING FIRST BENDING MODE OF  
HINGED BEAM WITH TIP MASS FROM FIRST BENDING MODE OF  
BEAM WITHOUT TIP MASS

The vibration modes of a rotating hinged beam must satisfy the following equation, which expresses the condition of zero moment at the root:

$$\omega_R^2 \int_0^L mxy \, dx - \Omega^2 \int_0^L (x + e)my \, dx = 0 \quad (B1)$$

or, in dimensionless form,

$$\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 \int_0^1 \bar{m}\bar{x}\bar{y} \, d\bar{x} - \int_0^1 (\bar{x} + \bar{e})\bar{m}\bar{y} \, d\bar{x} = 0 \quad (B2)$$

For any given beam the mode shapes of the nonrotating beam can readily be shown to satisfy this criterion exactly if  $e$  is zero and very closely if  $e$  is small; therefore, the nonrotating-beam mode shapes are good approximations to the rotating-beam mode shapes, regardless of the mass distribution of the beam. However, the nonrotating-beam mode shape must be that of the beam with the same mass distribution; the purpose of the present derivation is to go a step further and to obtain an approximate first mode shape for a nonrotating beam with tip mass in terms of the first mode of the same beam without tip mass. In view of the preceding argument, the mode shape obtained in this manner should serve as a good approximation to the first mode of the rotating or nonrotating beam with the same tip mass and when used in conjunction with the Rayleigh approach (eq. (1)) should yield a good approximation for the first bending frequency of a rotating or nonrotating hinged beam.

In deriving such a relation the assumption is made that the second derivative or curvature of the beam remains unchanged in the two configurations. Thus, the mode shape for the beam with tip mass is assumed to be of the form

$$y_1^* \approx y_1 + D_0 \bar{x} \approx Y_1 + D_0 \bar{x} \quad (B3)$$

where the first mode of the rotating beam without tip mass  $y_1$  is assumed to be approximately equal to the nonrotating-beam first mode shape  $Y_1$ . With this mode shape, the criterion of equation (B2) becomes

$$\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 \int_0^1 \bar{m}\bar{x}(Y_1 + D_0\bar{x})d\bar{x} - \int_0^1 \bar{m}(\bar{x} + \bar{e})(Y_1 + D_0\bar{x})d\bar{x} = 0 \quad (B4)$$

If, now, the mass distribution is considered to be made up of the continuous distributed mass of the beam  $m_d$  plus a concentrated tip mass, equation (B4) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d\bar{x}(Y_1 + D_0\bar{x})d\bar{x} + \left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 r[Y_1(1) + D_0] - \\ &\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d(\bar{x} + \bar{e})(Y_1 + D_0\bar{x})d\bar{x} - r(1 + \bar{e})[Y_1(1) + D_0] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (B5)$$

Inasmuch as  $Y_1$  and  $\bar{x}$  (the pendulum mode shape) are mode shapes of the hinged beam with mass distribution  $m_d$ , they must satisfy the orthogonality condition for normal modes for such a beam, namely,

$$\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d\bar{x}Y_1 d\bar{x} = 0$$

and, hence, equation (B5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 D_0 \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d\bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} + \left(\frac{\omega_R}{\Omega}\right)^2 r[Y_1(1) + D_0] - D_0 \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d\bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} - \\ &\bar{e} \int_0^1 \bar{m}_dY_1 d\bar{x} - \bar{e}D_0 \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d\bar{x} d\bar{x} - r(1 + \bar{e})[Y_1(1) + D_0] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (B6)$$

When this equation is solved for  $D_0$ , the result is

$$D_0 = \frac{\bar{e} \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d Y_1 d\bar{x} + \bar{e} r Y_1(1) - \left[ \left( \frac{\omega_R}{\Omega} \right)^2 - 1 \right] r Y_1(1)}{\left[ \left( \frac{\omega_R}{\Omega} \right)^2 - 1 \right] \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} + \left[ \left( \frac{\omega_R}{\Omega} \right)^2 - 1 \right] r - \bar{e} \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x} d\bar{x} - \bar{e} r} \quad (B7)$$

If the offset  $\bar{e}$  is zero, equation (B7) takes the much simpler form

$$D_0 = \frac{-r Y_1(1)}{\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} + r} \quad (B8)$$

or, with  $Y_1$  normalized to unity at the tip,

$$D_0 = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x}}{r}} \quad (B9)$$

By comparing the relative values of the terms of equation (B7) and by considering the overall influence of terms containing  $\bar{e}$ , small offsets can be shown to have a negligible influence on the value of  $D_0$  for values of the rotational-speed parameter encountered in helicopters. Also, for nonrotating beams,  $\bar{e}$  does not enter the problem and, hence, can be set equal to zero; thus, as mentioned before, the mode shape, based on the result of equation (B9), obtained in the following paragraphs, should serve as a good approximation for both rotating and nonrotating beams with and without offset.

Upon substituting the value of  $D_0$  in equation (B9) into equation (B3), the desired first mode shape of the beam with a mass at the tip is obtained as

$$Y_1^* = Y_1 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x}}{r}} \bar{x} \quad (B10)$$

and the slope  $(y_1^*)'$  and curvature  $(y_1^*)''$  of this mode shape are then given by

$$(y_1^*)' = Y_1' - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x}}{r}} \quad (B11)$$

$$(y_1^*)'' = Y_1'' \quad (B12)$$

(Eq. (B12), of course, expresses nothing more than the assumed equality of the second derivatives.) If the mode shape of a beam with a particular mass and stiffness distribution (but without tip mass) is known, expressions (B10) to (B12) thus permit the determination of an approximate mode shape for the same beam with any concentrated mass at the tip and can be used to evaluate the integrals of the basic Rayleigh equation (eq. (1)) by numerical methods; reasonably accurate values can easily be obtained in this manner for  $\omega_{NR1}$  and for  $K_{01}$  and  $K_{11}$ , from which the bending frequency at any rotational speed can be determined directly.

#### Beams With Linear Mass Distribution Plus Tip Mass

For the particular case of beams with a linear mass distribution plus a tip mass,  $\bar{m}_d = 1 - k\bar{x}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \bar{m}_d \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} &= \int_0^1 \bar{x}^2 d\bar{x} - k \int_0^1 \bar{x}^3 d\bar{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{3} - \frac{k}{4} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$D_0 = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{4 - 3k}{12r}} \quad (B13)$$

This result can be used in conjunction with the first mode shape given for hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions in table IV to obtain mode and frequency results for such beams.

#### Beams With Uniform Mass Distribution Plus Tip Mass

For the case of beams with a uniform mass distribution plus a tip mass,  $\bar{m}_d = 1$  and thus

$$D_0 = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{1}{3r}} \quad (B14)$$

#### Uniform Beam With Tip Mass

For the case of a uniform beam with an arbitrary tip mass,

$$\bar{m}_d = 1$$

and

$$\bar{EI} = 1$$

Thus,  $D_0$  is the same as for the preceding case. In this special case the integrals of the Rayleigh equation (eq. (1)), which permit the determination of  $\omega_{NR}$  and  $K$  and thus of  $\omega_R$ , can be evaluated exactly by the methods of reference 1 or 18. The results are

$$\int_0^1 \bar{m} (y_1^*)^2 d\bar{x} = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{r}{3r + 1} \quad (B15a)$$

$$\int_0^1 \bar{EI} \left[ (y_1^*)'' \right]^2 d\bar{x} = \frac{\beta_1^4}{4} \quad (B15b)$$

$$\int_0^1 \bar{I}_1 \left[ (y_1^*)' \right]^2 d\bar{x} = \frac{\beta_1^2}{12} + \frac{5}{16} + \frac{r\beta_1}{4}(\beta_1 + 3) + r \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{3r}} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{3r}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{12} + \frac{r}{4} \right) \quad (B15c)$$

$$\int_0^1 \bar{I}_{1e} \left[ (y_1^*)' \right]^2 d\bar{x} = \frac{\bar{e}}{4} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} + r\beta_1 \right) (\beta_1 + 3) - 2 \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{3r}} \right) \left( 4r - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\beta_1} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{3r}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} + r \right) \right] \quad (B15d)$$

where  $\beta_1 = 3.9266$ , from the results given in reference 20. In the preceding integrations  $\alpha_n$  (ref. 20) has been taken equal to unity; this assumption introduces a small error of less than 0.1 percent.

Equations (B15) are based on  $Y_1$  rather than  $y_1^*$  normalized to unity at the tip. To obtain equivalent formulas for  $y_1^*$  normalized to unity at the tip, these results must be divided by the factor  $\left( \frac{2}{3r + 1} \right)^2$ .

Nonrotating- and rotating-beam frequencies obtained by this method for the uniform beam are compared with more accurate results in the section of this paper entitled "Charts for Bending-Frequency Determination."

## REFERENCES

1. Timoshenko, S.: Vibration Problems in Engineering. Second ed., D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1937.
2. Myklestad, N. O.: Vibration Analysis. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1944.
3. Houbolt, John C.: Coupled Bending and Torsional Deformations of Twisted Rotating Blades Under Arbitrary Loading. Preprint No. 539, S.M.F. Fund Preprint, Inst. Aero. Sci., Inc., Jan. 1955.
4. Prewitt, R. H., and Wagner, R. A.: Frequency and Vibration Problems of Rotors. Jour. Aero. Sci., vol. 7, no. 10, Aug. 1940, pp. 444-450.
5. Morduchow, Morris: A Theoretical Analysis of Elastic Vibrations of Fixed-Ended and Hinged Helicopter Blades in Hovering and Vertical Flight. NACA TN 1999, 1950.
6. Horvay, Gabriel: Chordwise and Beamwise Bending Frequencies of Hinged Rotor Blades. Jour. Aero. Sci., vol. 15, no. 8, Aug. 1948, pp. 497-502.
7. Theodorsen, T.: Propeller Vibrations and the Effect of the Centrifugal Force. NACA TN 516, 1935.
8. Liebers, F.: Contribution to the Theory of Propeller Vibrations. NACA TM 568, 1930.
9. Liebers, Fritz: Resonance Vibrations of Aircraft Propellers. NACA TM 657, 1932.
10. Liebers, F.: Analysis of the Three Lowest Bending Frequencies of a Rotating Propeller. NACA TM 783, 1936.
11. Berry, Arthur: On the Vibrations of a Uniform Rod Rotating Uniformly About One End, Which Is Encasté. R. & M. No. 488, British ACA, Sept. 1918.
12. Webb, H. A., and Swain, Lorna M.: Vibration Speeds of Airscrew Blades. R. & M. No. 626, British ACA, May 1919.
13. Prohl, M. A.: A General Method for Calculating Critical Speeds of Flexible Rotors. Jour. Appl. Mech., vol. 12, no. 3, Sept. 1945, pp. A-142 - A-148.
14. Den Hartog, J. P.: Mechanical Vibrations. Second ed., McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1940.

15. Houbolt, John C., and Anderson, Roger A.: Calculation of Uncoupled Modes and Frequencies in Bending or Torsion of Nonuniform Beams. NACA TN 1522, 1948.
16. Ono, Akimasa: Lateral Vibrations of Tapered Bars. Jour. Soc. Mech. Engineers, vol. 28, no. 99, July 1925, pp. 429-441.
17. Stowell, Elbridge Z., Schwartz, Edward B., Houbolt, John C., and Schmieder, Albert K.: Bending and Shear Stresses Developed by the Instantaneous Arrest of the Root of a Cantilever Beam With a Mass at Its Tip. NACA WR L-586, 1944. (Formerly NACA MR L4K30.)
18. Felgar, Robert P., Jr.: Formulas for Integrals Containing Characteristic Functions of a Vibrating Beam. Cir. No. 14, Bur. Eng. Res., Univ. of Texas, 1950.
19. Lo, Hsu, and Renbarger, Jack L.: Bending Vibrations of a Rotating Beam. Proc. First U. S. Nat. Cong. Appl. Mech. (Chicago, Ill., 1951), A.S.M.E., 1952, pp. 75-79.
20. Young, Dana, and Felgar, Robert P., Jr.: Tables of Characteristic Functions Representing Normal Modes of Vibration of a Beam. Univ. of Texas Pub. No. 4913, Eng. Res. Ser. No. 44, Bur. Eng. Res., July 1, 1949.
21. Benscoter, Stanley U., and Gossard, Myron L.: Matrix Methods for Calculating Cantilever-Beam Deflections. NACA TN 1827, 1949.



TABLE I  
EXACT AND ESTIMATED FREQUENCIES FOR SEVERAL  
MANUFACTURED BLADES

		MODE	$\omega_{NR}$ , RADIANS/SEC		$\omega_R$ , RADIANS/SEC	
			EXACT	ESTIMATED	EXACT	ESTIMATED
m	EI	1st	17.3	17.4	49.2	47.7
		2nd	48.5	50.0	86.8	85.7
		3rd	95.5	101.0	137.0	137.8
		1st	21.6	21.1	50.6	49.2
		2nd	58.9	60.5	92.4	92.2
		3rd	112.1	122.0	148.0	154.0
		1st	21.9	21.1	74.0	78.3
		2nd	63.7	59.5	132.0	134.4
		3rd	126.0	125.5	200.0	207.5
		1st	13.4	14.6	37.9	37.8
		2nd	43.7	41.6	71.0	70.3
		3rd	94.9	94.5	125.0	124.0

TRUE  
FAIRED

ROOT TIP ROOT TIP

TABLE II

VALUES FOR INTEGRALS IN THE MODE-EXPANSION METHOD OF APPENDIX A

p	q	$S_{pq_0}$	$S_{pq_e}$	$S_{pq_k}$	$S_{pq_t}$	$I_{pq_0}$	$I_{pq_c}$	$M_{pq_0}$	$M_{pq_k}$	$R_{pq_t}$
Hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions										
0	0	1/3	1/2	1/4	1	0	0	1/3	1/4	r
	1	0	-0.18517	-0.05578	1	0	0	0	0.05577	r
	2	0	.09992	-.00165	1	0	0	0	.00165	r
	3	0	-.06926	-.00320	1	0	0	0	.00321	r
	4	0	.05296	-.00024	1	0	0	0	.00025	r
1	5	0	-.04287	-.00075	1	0	0	0	.00077	r
	1	1.59938	2.30532	1.26052	6.80791	59.43015	25.63938	1/4	.14214	r
	2	-.46528	-1.22263	-.18122	3.59935	0	30.97991	0	.05286	r
	3	-.09145	.20921	-.09117	3.78925	0	-4.62284	0	.00288	r
	4	-.03037	-.21872	-.02260	3.85869	0	7.13092	0	.00531	r
2	5	-.01293	.12567	-.01258	3.88921	0	-3.32571	0	.00082	r
	2	4.47610	6.62225	3.43015	17.79273	624.12075	299.60439	1/4	.12999	r
	3	-1.54866	-3.43733	-.80926	6.13170	0	239.3184	0	.05202	r
	4	-.37008	.28431	-.37093	6.53295	0	-15.99519	0	.00182	r
	5	-.14453	-.52531	-.12984	6.73955	0	48.63946	0	.00582	r
3	3	8.99985	-13.40607	6.82541	33.71970	2716.90000	1332.5410	1/4	.12741	r
	4	-3.15890	-6.67345	-1.76094	8.57761	0	892.5356	0	.05144	r
	5	-.80708	.31838	-.81443	9.12863	0	-30.36181	0	.00130	r
4	4	15.16836	22.65800	11.44593	54.58150	7945.0300	3931.674	1/4	.12652	r
	5	-5.27717	-10.91717	-2.97035	10.98707	0	2319.820	0	.05001	r
5	5	22.98186	34.37920	17.25665	80.37810	18500.2025	9629.3965	0	.12710	r
Cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions										
1	1	0.29833	0.39272	0.23958	1.16194	3.09056	0.59789	1/4	0.20163	r
	2	.17146	.10558	.18630	1.84496	0	2.97335	0	.03838	r
	3	-.19809	-.26802	-.13341	.98538	0	-1.10249	0	.00508	r
	4	.13660	.21828	.09267	1.64834	0	.93662	0	.00220	r
	5	-.11352	-.19058	-.07526	1.14799	0	-.67480	0	.00094	r
2	2	1.61955	2.16178	1.31905	8.10433	121.37958	49.26172	1/4	.14854	r
	3	-.04235	-.47251	.12583	5.58811	0	64.85774	0	.04771	r
	4	-.72797	-.91085	-.53287	3.39561	0	-13.73693	0	.00514	r
	5	.47229	.76571	.30697	5.70988	0	18.98574	0	.00430	r
3	3	4.46488	6.23803	3.50050	19.32474	951.63772	444.99392	1/4	.13308	r
	4	-.81857	-2.08457	-.29328	8.91208	0	367.5131	0	.04928	r
	5	-1.53861	-1.78527	-1.18157	5.04050	0	-40.74667	0	.00317	r
4	4	9.01387	12.86480	6.94974	35.72554	3654.3173	1765.9083	1/4	.12905	r
	5	-2.14253	-4.75477	-1.05264	12.17992	0	1209.091	0	.05007	r
5	5	15.20032	21.94810	11.63995	57.03349	9985.9627	4870.7227	1/4	.12687	r

TABLE III

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS WITH LINEAR  
MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1 \equiv \phi_1$	$Y_1' \equiv \phi_1'$	$Y_1'' \equiv \phi_1''$	$Y_2 \equiv \phi_2$	$Y_2' \equiv \phi_2'$	$Y_2'' \equiv \phi_2''$	$Y_3 \equiv \phi_3$	$Y_3' \equiv \phi_3'$	$Y_3'' \equiv \phi_3''$
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0$ (exact solution, ref. 20)									
0	0	0	3.5160	0	0	-22.0345	0	0	61.6972
1	.0168	.3274	3.0332	-.0926	-1.6776	-11.5406	.2281	3.7655	14.0984
2	.0639	.6065	2.5508	-.3011	-2.3240	-1.5432	.6045	3.1181	24.3627
3	.1365	.8378	2.0775	-.5261	-2.0351	6.9860	.7562	-.3551	40.5613
4	.2299	1.0226	1.6214	-.6835	-1.0114	12.9888	.5259	-4.0599	29.2300
5	.3395	1.1631	1.1938	-.7137	.4531	15.7253	.0197	-5.5520	1.2145
6	.4611	1.2627	.8083	-.5895	2.0194	15.0599	-.4738	-3.7912	32.4481
7	.5959	1.3266	.4799	-.3171	3.3709	11.5931	-.6574	.3568	46.6579
8	.7255	1.3612	.2246	.0700	4.2876	6.6336	-.3949	4.7354	37.2963
9	.8624	1.3745	.0590	.5238	4.7095	2.0411	.2285	7.3385	14.0713
10	1.0000	1.3765	0	1.0000	4.7808	0	1.0000	7.8487	0
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0$									
0	0	0	3.5104	0	0	-22.0247	0	0	61.7316
1	.0169	.4723	3.0282	-.0925	-2.0829	-11.5367	.2261	2.2608	14.2680
2	.0642	.7271	2.5482	-.3008	-2.2495	-1.5444	.6024	3.7628	24.1735
3	.1369	.9347	2.0760	-.5257	-1.5725	6.9810	.7553	1.5296	40.5000
4	.2304	1.0968	1.6207	-.6830	-.3015	12.9814	.5262	-2.2914	29.3314
5	.3400	1.2162	1.1937	-.7131	1.2418	15.7169	.0197	-5.0647	1.0704
6	.4617	1.2970	.8087	-.5890	2.7236	15.0516	-.4753	-4.9503	32.4148
7	.5914	1.3451	.4806	-.3166	3.8698	11.5857	-.6604	-1.8512	46.7572
8	.7259	1.3676	.2253	.0704	4.5356	6.6278	-.3978	2.6262	37.3956
9	.8626	1.3736	.0595	.5239	4.7607	2.0377	.2270	6.2482	14.0565
10	1.0000	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	7.7299	0	0

TABLE III.- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS WITH LINEAR  
MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right)$									
0	0	0.1508	3.0852	0	-0.7779	-17.9825	0	1.8715	49.0088
1	.0151	.4312	2.8044	-.0778	-1.8336	-10.5955	.1871	3.3746	14.8158
2	.0582	.6807	2.4942	-.2612	-2.1111	-2.7533	.5246	1.8048	-16.8271
3	.1263	.8962	2.1551	-.4723	-1.6386	4.8322	.7053	-1.5083	-34.9664
4	.2159	1.0753	1.7910	-.6361	-.5456	11.1252	.5543	-4.4456	-31.1090
5	.3234	1.2163	1.4102	-.6907	.9362	15.0784	.1097	-5.0240	-6.4431
6	.4450	1.3189	1.0259	-.5971	2.5002	15.9132	-.3927	-2.5050	26.1221
7	.5769	1.3847	.6580	-.3470	3.8252	13.4617	-.6432	2.0377	47.5240
8	.7154	1.4182	.3350	.0355	4.6675	8.4741	-.4394	6.2401	43.8272
9	.8572	1.4278	.0967	.5022	4.9778	2.8758	.1846	8.1542	18.6063
10	1.0000	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	0
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0(1 - x)$									
0	0	0.1247	2.5176	0	-0.5178	-11.4951	0	1.0789	26.4729
1	.0125	.3667	2.4201	-.0518	-1.3001	-7.8970	.1079	2.2098	11.4265
2	.0491	.5966	2.2996	-.1818	-1.6530	-3.5774	.3289	1.7288	-5.0368
3	.1088	.8117	2.1512	-.3471	-1.5179	1.3316	.5018	-.0799	-18.7863
4	.1900	1.0088	1.9705	-.4989	-.8741	6.4680	.4938	-2.3871	-24.1585
5	.2908	1.1841	1.7531	-.5863	.2412	11.2476	.2551	-3.9249	-16.5097
6	.4093	1.3337	1.4955	-.5622	1.7135	14.8933	-.1374	-3.3940	4.6998
7	.5426	1.4531	1.1943	-.3908	3.3378	16.4929	-.4768	-.1303	33.2025
8	.6879	1.5378	.8469	-.0570	4.8142	15.0877	-.4899	5.1385	54.9056
9	.8417	1.5829	.4513	.4244	5.7561	9.7945	.0240	9.7602	49.9675
10	1.0000	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	0

TABLE III.- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS WITH LINEAR  
MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right); EI = EI_0$									
0	0	0.1733	3.5961	0	-0.8526	-20.5149	0	2.0307	56.8179
1	.0173	.4812	3.0782	-.0853	-1.8857	-10.2793	.2031	3.1960	10.7772
2	.0654	.7375	2.5638	-.2738	-1.9658	-.6581	.5227	.9179	-24.7575
3	.1392	.9437	2.0614	-.4704	-1.2637	7.2497	.6145	-2.5205	-36.5657
4	.2336	1.1020	1.5835	-.5968	-.0501	12.4090	.3624	-4.6174	-22.1859
5	.3438	1.2164	1.1442	-.6018	1.3533	14.2921	-.0993	-3.9663	6.8125
6	.4654	1.2922	.7580	-.4665	2.6423	13.0765	-.4960	-.8880	32.2249
7	.5946	1.3362	.4391	-.2022	3.5963	9.6161	-.5848	2.9901	40.3627
8	.7283	1.3562	.1999	.1574	4.1269	5.2513	-.2857	5.8749	29.5511
9	.8639	1.3613	.0509	.5701	4.2990	1.5398	.3018	6.9825	10.3404
10	1.0000	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	0
$m = m_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right); EI = EI_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right)$									
0	0	0.1546	3.1688	0	-0.7222	-16.8561	0	1.6861	45.1241
1	.0155	.4404	2.8585	-.0722	-1.6728	-9.5343	.1686	2.8950	11.7757
2	.0595	.6921	2.5168	-.2395	-1.8638	-1.8680	.4581	1.2361	-17.8557
3	.1287	.9068	2.1467	-.4259	-1.3480	5.2897	.5817	-1.8134	-32.3125
4	.2194	1.0823	1.7557	-.5607	-.2821	10.8679	.4004	-4.1661	-24.9765
5	.3276	1.2180	1.3563	-.5889	1.0866	13.9363	-.0162	-4.1669	-.2658
6	.4493	1.3144	.9647	-.4802	2.4651	14.0175	-.4330	-1.5214	27.5563
7	.5808	1.3748	.6034	-.2337	3.5808	11.3083	-.5851	2.5189	42.1923
8	.7183	1.4046	.2979	.1244	4.2586	6.7837	-.3333	5.9375	35.4166
9	.8587	1.4129	.0836	.5502	4.4978	2.1918	-.2605	7.3951	13.9636
10	1.0000	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	1.0000	1.0000

TABLE III.- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS WITH LINEAR  
MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right); EI = EI_0(1 - \frac{x}{2})$									
0	0		2.5984	0		-11.0011	0		25.2707
1	.0128	0.1284	2.4797	-.0491	-0.4911	-7.2927	.1010	1.0099	9.7964
2	.0505	.3764	2.3338	-.1706	-1.2146	-2.8931	.2992	1.9826	-6.5750
3	.1115	.6098	2.1566	-.3206	-1.5002	1.9575	.4352	1.3592	-18.9042
4	.1940	.8255	1.9455	-.4511	-1.3046	6.7820	.3901	-1.4506	-21.5881
5	.2960	1.0200	1.6994	-.5143	-.6320	10.9396	.1398	-2.5029	-11.5213
6	.4150	1.1899	1.4185	-.4692	.4505	13.7170	-.2167	-3.5647	9.3586
7	.5482	1.3318	1.1048	-.2887	1.8050	14.4325	-.4771	-2.6041	33.1815
8	.6924	1.4423	.7609	.0339	3.2265	12.5408	-.4135	.6360	47.5995
9	.8443	1.5184	.3911	.4796	4.4562	7.7223	.1077	5.2112	39.7770
10	1.0000	1.5575	0	1.0000	5.2043	0	1.0000	8.9234	0
$m = m_0(1 - x); EI = EI_0$									
0	0		4.0558	0		-15.2162	0		35.5410
1	.0194	0.1939	3.3450	-.0607	-0.6069	-6.2023	.1174	1.1740	2.2191
2	.0722	.5284	2.6451	-.1842	-1.2348	1.8823	.2666	1.4916	-19.6272
3	.1515	.7929	1.9813	-.2908	-1.0659	7.6453	.2375	-.2901	-19.7496
4	.2506	.9911	1.3838	-.3237	-.3292	10.2183	.0253	-2.1229	-2.7888
5	.3636	1.1294	.8803	-.2570	.6672	9.7358	-.2135	-2.3870	15.9480
6	.4853	1.2175	.4904	-.0946	1.6238	7.2110	-.3018	-.8834	23.7445
7	.6120	1.2665	.2218	.1394	2.3397	4.0543	-.1633	1.3851	18.8323
8	.7408	1.2887	.0680	.4144	2.7503	1.5122	.1591	3.2238	8.5833
9	.8704	1.2955	.0068	.7056	2.9121	.2282	.5699	4.1081	1.4574
10	1.0000	1.2962	0	1.0000	2.9437	0	1.0000	4.3010	0

TABLE III.- Concluded

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS WITH LINEAR  
MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0(1 - \bar{x}); EI = EI_0(1 - \frac{\bar{x}}{2})$									
0	0		3.6228	0		-12.6640	0		28.6145
1	.0175	0.1752	3.1505	-.0521	-0.5212	-5.9369	.0990	0.9900	3.6038
2	.0666	.4903	2.6356	-.1636	-1.1148	.8058	.2389	1.3986	-15.6241
3	.1419	.7539	2.0961	-.2680	-1.0442	6.3475	.2357	-.0314	-18.9598
4	.2383	.9635	1.5602	-.3109	-.4288	9.5678	.0566	-1.7917	-6.0124
5	.3502	1.1195	1.0620	-.2604	.5049	10.0140	-.1781	-2.3466	12.4980
6	.4728	1.2257	.6358	-.1118	1.4867	8.1088	-.2941	-1.1598	23.4526
7	.6017	1.2893	.3106	.1170	2.2874	4.9844	-.1865	1.0759	21.2750
8	.7338	1.3203	.1034	.3955	2.7856	2.0367	.1270	3.1346	10.8683
9	.8668	1.3307	.0113	.6955	2.9997	.3379	.5504	4.2345	2.0489
10	1.0000	1.3318	0	1.0000	3.0448	0	1.0000	4.4958	0
$m = m_0(1 - \bar{x}); EI = EI_0(1 - \bar{x})$									
0	0		3.0750	0		-8.9963	0		18.1439
1	.0151	0.1507	2.8299	-.0385	-0.3854	-4.9931	.0671	0.6710	4.1930
2	.0584	.4337	2.5321	-.1266	-.8801	-.4387	.1769	1.0985	-8.8006
3	.1271	.6869	2.1832	-.2190	-.9247	4.0280	.2049	.2793	-14.5066
4	.2176	.9052	1.7937	-.2720	-.5297	7.5634	.0969	-1.0798	-9.2434
5	.3261	1.0846	1.3813	-.2507	-.2128	9.4334	-.0965	-1.9343	4.3850
6	.4484	1.2227	.9705	-.1368	1.1393	9.2835	-.2458	-1.4924	18.4222
7	.5803	1.3198	.5903	.0684	2.0523	7.3013	-.2175	.2825	24.3923
8	.7182	1.3788	.2735	.3458	2.7735	4.2407	.0451	2.6264	18.9564
9	.8589	1.4061	.0547	.6657	3.1987	1.3128	.4861	4.4100	6.8571
10	1.0000	1.4116	1.0000	1.0000	3.3434	0	1.0000	5.1389	0

TABLE IV

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING HINGED BEAMS WITH LINEAR MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1 = \phi_1$	$Y_1' = \phi_1'$	$Y_1'' = \phi_1''$	$Y_2 = \phi_2$	$Y_2' = \phi_2'$	$Y_2'' = \phi_2''$	$Y_3 = \phi_3$	$Y_3' = \phi_3'$	$Y_3'' = \phi_3''$
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0$ (exact solution, ref. 20)									
0	0	-2.7002	0	0	5.0043	0	0	-7.2193	0
1									
2									
3	-.4830	-1.8617	7.9736	.7001	.7950	-34.8133	-.6299	3.2792	65.6943
4									
5									
6	-.6620	.1938	11.6061	.2257	-4.7026	-10.5596	.5732	4.2548	-59.5223
7									
8									
9	-.3973	2.3756	9.3030	-.6005	-2.0600	32.9576	.1190	-7.0448	-10.6536
10									
11									
12	.2274	3.6749	3.5134	-.2940	4.9033	26.8434	-.6076	2.8935	76.8702
13									
14									
15	1.0000	3.9297	0	1.0000	7.0686	0	1.0000	10.2102	0
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0$									
0	0	-2.6675	0	0	4.8253	0	0	-6.5137	0
1	.1778	-2.4751	2.9017	.3217	3.7708	-16.1228	-.4342	-3.7078	43.4748
2	-.3428	-2.1026	5.6183	.5731	1.9000	-28.5821	-.6814	.7747	69.7829
3	-.4830	-1.5737	7.9748	.6997	-.3784	-34.8100	-.6298	4.9212	64.4864
4	-.5879	-.9222	9.8240	.6745	-2.5660	-33.4256	-.3017	6.8673	30.1462
5	-.6494	-.1890	11.0559	.5034	-4.1825	-24.7037	.1561	5.7417	-17.7598
6	-.6620	.5809	11.6059	.2246	-4.8692	-10.5043	.5389	2.0541	-57.7175
7	-.6233	1.3413	11.4610	-.1000	-4.4659	6.1398	.6758	-2.5328	-71.7578
8	-.5339	2.0490	10.6619	-.3977	-3.0431	21.7025	.5070	-5.9464	-53.4956
9	-.3973	2.6669	9.3030	-.6006	-.8832	32.9430	.1106	-6.6245	-10.8931
10	-.2195	3.1679	7.5279	-.6595	1.5878	37.6597	-.3311	-4.2021	37.3827
11	-.0083	3.5357	5.5239	-.5667	3.9028	35.2256	-.6112	.3507	70.4947
12	.2274	3.7713	3.5133	-.2935	5.6720	26.7997	-.5878	5.2169	75.1702
13	.4788	3.8904	1.7444	.0847	6.6930	15.2316	-.2400	8.6477	52.3442
14	.7382	3.9269	.4821	.5309	7.0367	4.6639	.3365	9.9528	18.2343
15	1.0000		0	1.0000		0	1.0000		0



TABLE IV.- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING HINGED BEAMS WITH LINEAR MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0(1 - \frac{x}{2})$									
0	0	-2.4011	0	0	4.2349	0	0	-5.7084	0
1	-.1601	-2.2545	2.1968	.2823	3.4337	-12.1633	-.3806	-3.5718	32.8485
2	-.3104	-1.9610	4.4128	.5112	1.9512	-22.9509	-.6187	.0330	57.1675
3	-.4411	-1.5283	6.5121	.6413	.0414	-29.0968	-.6118	3.8918	39.0998
4	-.5430	-.9732	8.3585	.6441	-1.9342	-30.1375	-.3523	6.2024	36.3014
5	-.6079	-.3211	9.8221	.5151	-3.5700	-24.9921	.0612	5.9598	-3.3443
6	-.6293	.3949	10.7894	.2771	-4.4964	-14.2022	.4585	3.1149	-43.9533
7	-.6030	1.1363	11.1731	-.0227	-4.4618	.4449	.6662	-1.2129	-67.5091
8	-.5272	1.8610	10.9231	-.3201	-3.3977	16.1636	.5843	-5.1621	-61.8610
9	-.4031	2.5269	10.0375	-.5466	-1.4512	29.6539	.2385	-6.8767	-26.7887
10	-.2347	3.0959	8.5728	-.6433	1.0303	37.8479	-.2199	-5.2857	24.2333
11	-.0283	3.5382	6.6547	-.5747	3.5665	38.6874	-.5723	-.8435	68.7554
12	.2076	3.8277	4.4883	-.3369	5.6618	31.8878	-.6286	4.6710	85.5398
13	.4635	3.9981	2.3693	.0406	6.9620	19.5720	-.3172	8.9872	66.4744
14	.7300	4.0501	.6982	.5047	7.4296	6.4608	.2820	10.7702	25.3995
15	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0
$m = m_0; EI = EI_0(1 - x)$									
0	0	-1.8612	0	0	2.8391	0	0	-3.4482	0
1	-.1241	-1.7765	1.2599	.1893	2.4377	-6.0403	-.2299	-2.5277	13.9649
2	-.2425	-1.6000	2.6412	.3518	1.6557	-11.8108	-.3984	-.7583	27.3446
3	-.3492	-1.3272	4.0919	.4622	.5632	-16.5435	-.4489	1.4065	33.6311
4	-.4377	-.9572	5.5338	.4997	-.7071	-19.2804	-.3552	3.2949	29.5841
5	-.5015	-.4940	6.9600	.4526	-1.9666	-19.1626	-.1335	4.2065	14.6758
6	-.5344	.0539	8.2356	.3215	-2.9887	-15.6121	.1449	3.6496	-7.9710
7	-.5308	.6722	9.2994	.1222	-3.5362	-8.4580	.3882	1.5779	-31.5748
8	-.4860	1.3411	10.0650	-.1135	-3.3992	1.9007	.4934	-1.4555	-46.9233
9	-.3966	2.0346	10.4435	-.3402	-2.4389	14.3995	.3964	-4.3171	-44.9846
10	-.2609	2.7212	10.3457	-.5027	-.6351	27.2556	.1086	-5.5308	-20.5659
11	-.0795	3.3634	9.6854	-.5451	1.8695	38.0134	-.2615	-3.8912	23.7570
12	.1447	3.9182	8.3825	-.4204	4.7359	43.7041	-.5209	1.0372	74.7164
13	.4039	4.3385	6.3673	-.1047	7.4140	41.1267	-.4517	8.0094	108.0221
14	.6951	4.5730	3.5845	.3896	9.1568	27.2670	.0822	13.7667	92.3208
15	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0

TABLE IV.-- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING HINGED BEAMS WITH LINEAR MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right); EI = EI_0$									
0	0	-2.3363	0	0	4.0912	0	0	-5.5947	0
1	-.1558	-2.1488	2.8306	.2727	3.0857	-15.4147	-.3730	-2.8156	43.3868
2	-.2990	-1.7886	5.4383	.4785	1.3335	-26.8339	-.5607	1.3899	65.7475
3	-.4182	-1.2830	7.6302	.5674	-.7308	-31.5958	-.4680	4.9171	55.0307
4	-.5038	-.6693	9.2606	.5186	-2.6093	-28.7323	-.1402	6.0537	17.6072
5	-.5484	.0096	10.2394	.3447	-3.8621	-19.1453	.2634	4.2957	-27.5745
6	-.5478	.7083	10.5356	.0872	-4.2068	-5.2516	.5497	.5225	-58.9163
7	-.5005	1.3836	10.1773	-.1932	-3.5727	9.6994	.5846	-3.4830	-62.3944
8	-.4083	1.9975	9.2456	-.4314	-2.1027	22.4495	.3524	-5.8934	-37.4169
9	-.2751	2.5203	7.8663	-.5716	-.1044	30.4780	-.0405	-5.6463	3.9909
10	-.1071	2.9330	6.1992	-.5787	2.0318	32.5262	-.4169	-2.8473	43.5972
11	.0884	3.2285	4.4254	-.4431	3.9288	28.8072	-.6068	1.3765	65.5174
12	.3037	3.4124	2.7358	-.1812	5.3124	20.8910	-.5150	5.4594	62.9664
13	.5312	3.5029	1.5192	.1730	6.0784	11.3644	-.1510	8.1471	40.7963
14	.7647	3.5298	.3538	.5782	6.3271	3.3416	.3921	9.1186	13.4256
15	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0
$m = m_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right); EI = EI_0 \left(1 - \frac{x}{2}\right)$									
0	0	-2.1075	0	0	3.5959	0	0	-4.8668	0
1	-.1405	-1.9632	2.1650	.2937	2.8262	-11.7139	-.3245	-2.7515	32.6840
2	-.2714	-1.6764	4.5162	.4281	1.4247	-21.3762	-.5079	.6587	53.5102
3	-.3831	-1.2583	6.2980	.5231	-.3274	-26.7516	-.4640	3.9138	50.6902
4	-.4670	-.7296	7.9670	.5013	-2.0558	-26.4102	-.2030	5.4909	24.6040
5	-.5157	-.1191	9.2014	.3642	-3.3735	-20.1587	.1630	4.6057	-13.7307
6	-.5236	.5384	9.9102	.1393	-3.9664	-9.1019	.4700	1.5683	-47.2762
7	-.4877	1.2046	10.0412	-.1251	-3.6638	4.5670	.5746	-2.3134	-60.4825
8	-.4074	1.8407	9.5875	-.3694	-2.4809	18.0105	.4204	-5.2843	-46.3612
9	-.2847	2.4110	8.5912	-.5347	-.6194	28.3717	.0681	-5.9149	-9.9582
10	-.1240	2.8856	7.1455	-.5760	1.5746	33.4411	-.3262	-3.7545	33.4867
11	.0684	3.2447	5.3954	-.4711	3.6896	32.2076	-.5763	.4454	65.2075
12	.2847	3.4812	3.5362	-.2251	5.3528	25.2411	-.5468	5.0645	71.5806
13	.5168	3.6044	1.8125	.1318	6.3407	14.7929	-.2092	8.4144	51.3484
14	.7571	3.6433	.5182	.5545	6.6828	4.6798	.3517	9.7239	18.4557
15	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0	1.0000	0	0

TABLE IV.- Continued

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING HINGED BEAMS WITH LINEAR MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0(1 - \frac{x}{L}); EI = EI_0(1 - x)$									
0	0	-1.6543	0	0	3.4651	0	0	-3.0051	0
1	-.1103	-1.5682	1.2820	.1643	2.0642	-6.0465	-.2003	-2.0645	14.3350
2	-.2148	-1.3902	2.6679	.3020	1.2932	-11.6724	-.3380	-.3264	26.9253
3	-.3075	-1.1178	4.0886	.3882	.2431	-15.9371	-.3597	1.6735	31.1310
4	-.3500	-.7536	5.4721	.4044	-.9314	-17.8592	-.2482	3.2227	24.3216
5	-.4323	-.3051	6.7435	.3423	-2.0293	-16.7340	-.0333	3.6744	7.4502
6	-.4526	.2153	7.8273	.2070	-2.8297	-12.2504	.2116	2.6991	-14.6474
7	-.4383	.7902	8.6503	.0184	-3.1264	-4.6272	.3916	.4730	-34.2032
8	-.3856	1.3977	9.1450	-.1901	-2.7646	5.3591	.4231	-2.2779	-42.7143
9	-.2924	2.0120	9.2516	-.3744	-1.6775	16.3886	.2712	-4.4252	-33.8828
10	-.1583	2.6041	8.9210	-.4862	.0846	26.6827	-.0238	-4.7776	-6.5779
11	.0153	3.1425	8.1173	-.4806	2.3363	34.1999	-.3423	-2.5501	33.1451
12	.2248	3.5944	6.8194	-.3248	4.7546	36.8503	-.5123	2.1574	71.8610
13	.4645	3.9265	5.0225	-.0078	6.8945	32.7806	-.3684	8.0186	90.9456
14	.7262	4.1066	2.7389	.4518	8.2232	20.6465	.1667	12.4991	71.1259
15	1.0000		0	1.0000		0	1.0000		0
$m = m_0(1 - \frac{x}{L}); EI = EI_0$									
0	0	-1.5091	0	0	2.1411	0	0	-2.5582	0
1	-.1006	-1.3324	2.6772	.1427	1.4053	-11.3779	-.1705	-.8148	27.6738
2	-.1894	-1.0003	5.0299	.2364	.1972	-18.6533	-.2249	1.4862	36.4609
3	-.2561	-.5501	6.8123	.2496	-1.0696	-19.5232	-.1258	2.8127	20.8593
4	-.2928	-.0288	7.8813	.1783	-1.9884	-14.1242	.0617	2.3549	-7.4162
5	-.2947	.5141	8.2013	.0457	-2.2893	-4.5930	.2187	.4591	-30.0183
6	-.2604	1.0334	7.8349	-.1069	-1.9048	5.9348	.2493	-1.7115	-34.1493
7	-.1916	1.4928	6.9215	-.2339	-.9611	14.4825	.1352	-2.9417	-19.1967
8	.0920	1.8686	5.6493	-.2980	.2897	19.1285	-.0409	-2.6244	5.1045
9	.0325	2.1505	4.2248	-.2787	1.5634	19.3997	-.2358	-.9652	25.9492
10	.1759	2.3411	2.8430	-.1744	2.6292	16.1429	-.3002	1.2810	34.8202
11	.3320	2.4537	1.6634	.0008	3.3640	11.0251	-.2148	3.2917	30.8241
12	.4956	2.5083	.7904	.2251	3.7635	5.8786	.0047	4.5778	19.3206
13	.6628	2.5274	.2606	.4760	3.9154	2.1146	.3098	5.1208	7.7297
14	.8313	2.5308	.0359	.7370	3.9444	.3109	.6512	5.2315	1.2214
15	1.0000		0	0		0	1.0000		0

TABLE IV.- Concluded

MODE RESULTS FOR NONROTATING HINGED BEAMS WITH LINEAR MASS AND STIFFNESS DISTRIBUTIONS

Station	$Y_1$	$Y_1'$	$Y_1''$	$Y_2$	$Y_2'$	$Y_2''$	$Y_3$	$Y_3'$	$Y_3''$
$m = m_0(1 - \bar{x}); EI = EI_0(1 - \frac{\bar{x}}{2})$									
0	0	-1.3683	0	0	1.8817	0	0	-2.2572	0
1	-.0912	-1.2273	2.1268	.1254	1.3053	-8.8479	-.1505	-.8715	21.7677
2	-.1731	-.9526	4.1481	.2125	.3843	-15.2839	-.2086	1.0883	30.8281
3	-.2366	-.5655	5.8470	.2332	-.8044	-17.1710	-.1360	2.4377	21.1573
4	-.2743	-.0984	7.0565	.1796	-1.7075	-13.8954	.0265	2.3568	-1.3903
5	-.2808	.4100	7.6765	.0658	-2.1257	-6.4412	.1836	.8750	-23.3985
6	-.2535	.9190	7.6819	-.0739	-1.9280	3.0165	.2419	-1.1742	-32.2246
7	-.1922	1.3913	7.1221	-.2045	-1.1527	11.8656	.1637	-2.6558	-23.1981
8	-.0995	1.7972	6.1118	-.2813	.0165	17.8750	-.0134	-2.7629	-1.5876
9	.0203	2.1176	4.8141	-.2802	1.3170	19.8367	-.1976	-1.4052	21.2899
10	.1615	2.3460	3.4186	-.1924	2.4906	17.8332	-.2913	.8298	34.8049
11	.3179	2.4884	2.1148	-.0264	3.3583	13.0866	-.2359	3.0677	34.5490
12	.4838	2.5613	1.0648	.1975	3.8625	7.4790	-.0314	4.6312	23.7284
13	.6545	2.5883	.3729	.4550	4.0667	2.8817	.2773	5.3430	10.2935
14	.8271	2.5934	.0547	.7261	4.1079	.4541	.6335	5.4972	1.7510
15	1.0000		0	1.0000		0	1.0000		0
$m = m_0(1 - \bar{x}); EI = EI_0(1 - \bar{x})$									
0	0	-1.1222	0	0	1.3728	0	0	-1.5560	0
1	-.0748	-1.0267	1.4218	.0915	1.0305	-5.2011	-.1037	-.7877	11.8732
2	-.1433	-1.2587	2.8943	.1602	.4020	-9.6016	-.1562	.4284	18.9034
3	-.1989	-.5499	4.2872	.1878	-.3755	-11.9049	-.1277	1.5050	16.7673
4	-.2356	-.1864	5.4778	.1620	-1.1116	-11.2941	-.0274	1.8722	5.7258
5	-.2480	.2356	6.3621	.0879	-1.6078	-7.6441	.0975	1.2737	-9.3345
6	-.2323	.6908	6.8635	-.0193	-1.7061	-1.5725	.1824	-.0748	-21.0490
7	-.1862	1.1511	6.9403	-.1331	-1.3297	5.6793	.1774	-1.5500	-23.0546
8	-.1095	1.5883	6.5903	-.2216	-.5045	12.5389	.0741	-2.3886	-13.1568
9	-.0036	1.9768	5.8531	-.2553	.6438	17.4785	-.0852	-2.0398	5.3345
10	.1282	2.2964	4.8088	-.2124	1.9177	19.3913	-.2212	-.4364	24.8731
11	.2813	2.5345	3.3747	-.0846	3.0957	17.9102	-.2503	1.9527	37.0753
12	.4502	2.6884	2.2986	.1218	3.9904	13.5472	-.1201	4.3263	36.7275
13	.6275	2.7669	1.1517	.3878	4.5050	7.6745	.1683	5.9419	24.6763
14	.8139	2.7912	.3206	.6882	4.6775	2.3373	.5645	6.5395	8.3232
15	1.0000		0	1.0000		0	1.0000		0

TABLE V

MODE COEFFICIENTS FOR ROTATING BEAMS HINGED AT THE ROOT

$$y_n = \sum_{q=0}^5 A_{nq} \phi_q$$

n	q	$A_{nq}$							
		Uniform mass and stiffness distributions						Linear mass and stiffness distributions ( $m_t = EI_t = 0$ )	
		$\Omega/\omega_{NR_1} = 1$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR_1} = 1.02$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR_1} = 1.36$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR_1} = 1.44$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR_1} = 1$		
		$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$			$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	
		r = 0		r = 0.1	r = 0.5		r = 1	r = 0	
1	0	0	-0.00676	-2.99989	-1.50000	-3.00000	0.38847	0.38042	
	1	.90279	.88995	3.59557	2.19920	3.57296	.57936	.57921	
	2	.08290	.09482	.30674	.22694	.32128	.02942	.03739	
	3	.01170	.01223	.06637	.05056	.07153	.00226	.00234	
	4	.00209	.00150	.02200	.01656	.02408	.00053	.00071	
2	5	.00052	.00827	.00920	.00673	.01011	-.00003	-.00007	
	0	0	.00111	-3.00008	-1.50000	-3.00000	.21916	.21681	
	1	-.08920	-.10460	-5.12037	-2.72581	-5.17981	.31280	.30752	
	2	.95499	.95733	7.59936	4.20150	7.51089	.43608	.43748	
	3	.11344	.13274	1.08367	.73215	1.18259	.02899	.03480	
3	4	.01745	.02015	.31287	.21113	.34805	.00216	.00241	
	5	.00332	-.00672	.12455	.08096	.13835	.00082	.00098	
	0	0	-.00028	-3.00002	-1.50000	-3.00000	.15969	.15854	
	1	-.00209	.00029	-4.11650	-2.04984	-4.10909	.21031	.20886	
	2	-.12027	-.14548	-6.70530	-3.73548	-6.98322	.23822	.23474	
3	3	.99297	1.02956	12.14772	6.54922	12.06709	.36653	.36824	
	4	.11228	.13716	2.01361	1.31803	2.27887	.02448	.02874	
	5	.01711	-.02126	.66071	.41804	.74647	.00077	.00089	


TABLE VI

MODE COEFFICIENTS FOR ROTATING CANTILEVER BEAMS

$$y_n = \sum_{q=1}^5 A_{nq} \phi_q$$

		$A_{nq}$															
		Uniform mass and stiffness distributions												Linear mass and stiffness distributions ( $m_t = EI_t = 0$ )			
n	q	$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 2$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 3$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 4$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 6$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 7.37$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 10.43$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 10.42$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 14.76$	$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 1.97$		$\Omega/\omega_{NR1} = 5.91$	
		$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$				$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 0\%$	$\bar{\epsilon} = 10\%$
		$r = 0$								$r = 0.5$	$r = 1$	$r = 0.5$	$r = 1$	$r = 0$			
1	1	1.04097	1.04089	1.06395	1.06197	1.07930	1.07532	1.09529	1.08853	1.10074	1.10782	1.10942	1.11411	1.03214	1.03585	1.08425	1.06814
	2	-.04833	-.04894	-.07740	-.07629	-.09825	-.09511	-.12241	-.11612	-.12739	-.13759	-.14118	-.14791	-.04119	-.04395	-.11831	-.10205
	3	.00871	.00955	.01624	.01732	.02318	.02415	.03332	.03361	.03361	.03803	.04038	.04345	.01013	.00911	.03656	.03537
	4	-.00204	-.00230	-.00445	-.00486	-.00713	-.00756	-.01177	-.01195	-.01235	-.01501	-.01645	-.01863	-.00217	-.00190	-.01081	-.01003
	5	.00069	.00080	.00165	.00187	.00290	.00320	.00557	.00593	.00538	.00676	.00783	.00899	.00109	.00088	.00832	.00858
2	1	.04394	.04433	.06651	.06533	.08100	.07815	.09573	.09055	-1.52892	-3.09047	-1.48611	-3.03164	.45247	.45453	.47752	.46764
	2	.94669	.94331	.91470	.91041	.89001	.88517	.85678	.85126	2.46260	4.10283	2.44348	4.08961	.52469	.52591	.48967	.48853
	3	.00269	.00501	.00581	.01007	.00935	.01538	.01593	.02443	-.04590	-.20169	-.08323	-.26294	.01908	.01627	.01733	.02711
	4	.00864	.00957	.01669	.01827	.02505	.02708	.03951	.04180	.13421	.24787	.16179	.28779	.00461	.00390	.02109	.02216
	5	-.00197	-.00222	-.00372	-.00409	-.00541	-.00578	-.00796	-.00805	-.02198	-.05853	.03593	-.08283	-.00085	-.00062	-.00561	-.00544
3	1	-.00837	-.00927	-.01519	-.01646	-.02116	-.02251	-.02918	-.03024	-2.20034	-4.37577	-2.22531	-4.40523	.26764	.26961	.25087	.24559
	2	-.00253	.00497	-.00554	-.01020	-.00925	-.01605	-.01695	-.02690	-2.10654	-3.87354	-2.02987	-3.71664	.29081	.29247	.28773	.28096
	3	.98895	.98801	.97492	.97254	.95671	.95254	.91636	.90939	4.63597	8.28092	4.54906	8.16877	.41432	.41420	.38838	.38889
	4	.01395	.01729	.02882	.03526	.04586	.05527	.07897	.09244	.32641	.31370	.28756	.19255	.02430	.02151	.04932	.05888
	5	.00802	.00894	.01699	.01887	.02783	.03075	.05079	.05531	.34450	.65469	.41856	.76055	.00292	.00222	.02369	.02369

# Cantilever beams



# Hinged beams




Figure 1.- Beams treated by both the "exact" and Rayleigh methods.




Figure 2.- Effect of rotational speed on the bending frequencies of a uniform hinged beam.






Figure 3.- Effect of rotational speed on the bending frequencies of a hinged beam with linear mass and stiffness distribution.




Figure 4.- Comparison of frequencies of uniform and "linear" hinged beams with zero offset.




Figure 5.- Effect of rotational speed on the bending frequencies of a uniform cantilever beam.




Figure 6.- Effect of rotational speed on the bending frequencies of a cantilever beam with linear mass and stiffness distribution.




Figure 7.- Comparison of frequencies of uniform and "linear" cantilever beams with zero offset.




Figure 8.- Bending frequencies of a uniform cantilever beam with a mass at the tip and with zero offset.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .




Figure 9.- Bending frequencies of a uniform hinged beam with a mass at the tip and with zero offset.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .




Figure 10.- Bending frequencies of a uniform hinged beam with a mass at the tip and with zero offset as a function of cantilever-beam rotational-speed parameter.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .






Figure 11.- Bending frequency coefficients  $a_n$  for hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 12.- Zero-offset Southwell coefficient  $K_{0n}$  for hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 13.- Offset-correction factors for Southwell coefficients  $\bar{K}_{1n}$  for hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 14.- Bending frequency coefficients  $a_n$  for cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 15.- Zero-offset Southwell coefficients  $K_{0n}$  for cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 16.- Offset-correction factors for Southwell coefficients  $\bar{K}_{1n}$  for cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 17.- Bending frequency coefficients for nonrotating uniform cantilever beams with a mass at the tip.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .




Figure 18.- Zero-offset Southwell coefficients for a uniform cantilever beam with a mass at the tip.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .






Figure 19.- Bending frequency coefficients for nonrotating uniform cantilever beams with a mass at the tip.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .




Figure 20.- Zero-offset Southwell coefficients for a uniform hinged beam

with a mass at the tip.  $r = \frac{\text{Tip mass}}{\text{Beam mass}}$ .






Figure 21.- Offset-correction factors for Southwell coefficients for the pendulum mode of hinged beams with linear mass distribution plus a mass at the tip.



(a) Cantilever beams with linear stiffness distribution.

Figure 22.- A new rotating beam frequency coefficient which is essentially independent of beam mass distribution.



(b) Hinged beams with linear stiffness distribution.

Figure 22.- Concluded.




Figure 23.- Bending modes of nonrotating hinged beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 24.- Bending modes of nonrotating cantilever beams with linear mass and stiffness distributions.




Figure 25.- Comparison of bending modes of a rotating and nonrotating uniform hinged beam.






Figure 26.- Comparison of bending modes for a rotating and nonrotating hinged beam with linear mass and stiffness distribution.




Figure 27.- Comparison of bending modes of a rotating and nonrotating uniform cantilever beam.




Figure 28.- Comparison of bending modes of a rotating and nonrotating cantilever beam with linear mass and stiffness distribution.




Figure 29.- Comparison of bending modes of a rotating and nonrotating uniform hinged beam with a tip mass equal to the mass of the beam.




Figure 30.- Comparison of bending modes of a rotating and nonrotating uniform cantilever beam with a mass at the tip.